Mr. Pulton Consider'd.

Imprimatur

Liber cui titulus [Mr *Pulton* Consider'd in his Sincerity, Reasonings, Authorities, *&c.*]

Novemb. 25. 1687.

H. Maurice, *Reverendissimo in Christo P. D.* Wilhelmo *Archiepiscopo Cant. à Sacris.*

Mr. Pulton Consider'd

In his { Sincerity, Reasonings, Authorities.

OR A

JUST ANSWER

To what HE hath hitherto published in His

TRUE ACCOUNT; His TRUE and FULL ACCOUNT of a *Conference*, &c. His REMARKS; and in them his pretended *Confutation* of what he calls D. *T*'s *Rule of Faith*.

By the said *THO. TENISON*, D. D.

LONDON,

Printed for **Richard Chiswell**, at the *Rose* and *Crown* in St. *Paul*'s Church-Yard. M DC LXXXVII.

TO THE

PARISHIONERS

OF

St. *MARTINS* in the Fields,

AND

St. *JAMES*'s Weſtminſter.

My moſt Worthy Friends,

THE *Jeſuit* who occaſioned my firſt application to you in this way, has by *his* Letter, mov'd me to give you this Second trouble: Perhaps it may be the laſt in this kind; for I do not envy him the Honour of throwing the firſt, and the ſecond, and the third handful of Dirt. I am unawares enſnared into the moſt diſagreeable Employment of *defending* and *proving*: But this I have to offer in juſt Excuſe, That I went in the ſimplicity of a Chriſtian, as to a Private Diſcourſe, which the Arts of others have im-

improv'd into a Publick Brawl. I will not ſo much ſuſpect your Sagacity, as to imagine you do not gueſs at the reaſon why my ſelf, and much better men, are on this manner treated; why that Reverend Perſon, the *Dean of St. Paul's*, is here (*a*) call'd, *moſt diſingenuous*; and elſewhere egregiouſly ſlander'd, as one (*b*) who has exchanged *Chriſtianity* for *Paganiſm*: Why the *Reverend Dean of Canterbury* has been in terms revil'd, (*c*) as a Writer *void* of *Modeſty*, *Charity*, *Sincerity*, and *good Manners*: Why the Reverend Mr. *Wake* (*d*) has been *juſt now* accuſed of *Calumnies*, *Unſincerities*, *willful Miſtakes*, and *Plain Contradictions*. You can well underſtand, that this *Work* is laid before us for the hindering of *better*; and that they ſay this Ill of us, not becauſe we are *ſuch*, but becauſe we are not *their's*.

(*a*) Mr. *Pulton's* Remarks, *p.* 38.
(*b*) Concl. of *Pax Vobis.*
(*c*) Reaſon and Antiquity, *p.* 45.
(*d*) A Reply to the Def. of the Expoſ. of the Church of *England.*

Mr. *Pulton* (in his Letter to you) is unwilling to believe that any *Romaniſts* ſpread falſe ſtories of me; yet I have ſpoken with great numbers of you who have *heard* them, from the mouths of the *leſs generous* of them, in publick places. In due time they may call in queſtion *that ſenſe* too.

He tells you further of Letters ſent into the *North* and *Weſt* of *England*, in which He and his Brethren were *miſreported*. If ſuch Papers were ſent, I did no more, either by direct, or indirect

Or-

Order, occaſion the writing of them, than I have ſubſcribed *Pope Pius's Creed.* This matter had been more probably laid, if he had mentioned the other Points of the Compaſs, and told of Letters ſent into thoſe parts of *England* where I have liv'd. For (I imagine) he does not take *NORFOLK* for a *Northern* County.

He ſpeaks (here) of *Bitterneſs* and *Scurrility*, and tells the World elſewhere, he has *not gall enough for me* (*a*), tho he ſeems at preſent troubled with the *over-flowing of it.* And yet the provocation was only this *great Truth*, That his Patient, *J. S.* grew worſe under his hands. *J. S.* is now under better. I voluntarily own'd what I then thought leſs decent, and have accounted for it; and I have been, by my Friends, reprov'd for making *Apologies* in my Epiſtle Dedicatory, for *Warmneſſes*, which, they ſay, they cannot find in the Book.

(*a*) Mr. P's Rem. p. 32.

The *Jeſuit* would fix that *Indignation* which I ſpeak of to you, upon *Perſons* and *Orders*, when in expreſs words, I make the Objects of it to be *Hypocriſie* and *Injuſtice.* And perceiving *in him* too great a Degree of thoſe Evils, my reſentment, ſuch as it was, was reaſonable. And for my *Memory*, it offer'd me a wholeſom Admonition, when I met with a ſecond *Gubbard*, who attempted

ed to take away, I do not say, the *Fleeces*, but those things which have ever been much dearer to me, *the Souls of my Sheep*. This he, and his Friend (*a*) (who in part repeats him, and then enlarges) has construed, as a *Grudge*, and a *Prejudice* of *thirty years standing*, and an impotence in retaining a *Childish* impression for so many years: But 'tis no more *Prejudice* and *Childishness*, than for one, who, in his Youth, has read the History of *Naboth's Vineyard*, and hates the Encroachment, to think of it a-fresh, when he sees a man invading his *own*.

(*a*) Advice to the *Pulpits*, p. 26, 27, 28, 29.

For the future, seeing I now know him better than at first I did; and have found him, instead of a serious Schollar, a man of Comical, and Jocular Humour, (*b*) in *misrepresenting* and *exposing*; I shall do Justice upon him, by that which (I hope) is no unbecoming *Negligence*.

(*b*) See his Rem. p. 36.

He goes on, but steps into a great Mistake, by saying, I pretend to prove, that Mr. *Gubbard* was a *Priest, by his favour with the Committee*. For, besides that I *there* pretend not to such a Proof, otherwise than the Circumstances of the Relation prove it; I have said, That the Committee, who put him in as a *Protestant Dissenter*, put him out, when they dis-

diſcover'd him to be a *Roman*. The Grounds upon which they went; may, in time, be publiſhed.

But he tells you, he might have preached up *Purgatory*, (which, by the way, was not the openeſt Point he preached) without being a *Romaniſt*: And in one ſenſe I allow it; for *Bellarmine* argues for a *Purgatory*, from the *Poet Virgil*; but it was not certainly that *Purgatory* out of which men are relieved by *Maſſes*. And ſuch a Purgatory (notwithſtanding Mr. P's Suggeſtion) Mr. *Thorndike* could not hold; having forbidden his *Nieces* to *marry* with any who ſhould go to *Maſs*.

Nor did he, in Mr. *Pulton*'s way, deſire an *Ora pro Animâ, to be engraved on his Tomb*. For he imitated ſome Chriſtians about the *Fourth Age*, who *wiſh'd Reſt* to none but thoſe who, as they thought, already enjoy'd it. And even this *Wiſh* of theirs, if it had *Charity*, it had alſo (in my Opinion) *weakneſs* in it.

That which follows concerns the *ſuffering of his Family* (in the Evil Times); from the Honour of which I deſire not to detract. It ſeems by his Story, that the *Spirit of perſecution* has not confin'd it ſelf to the *Eſtabliſhed Church*, which, ſo far as I can underſtand the Temper of it, had rather ſuf-

fer injuries than do them. That you may continue in the ſafe boſom of this *Apoſtolical Church*, is, and ſhall be my moſt importunate Addreſs to Almighty God in your behalf, as being,

My moſt Worthy Friends,

Your moſt Obliged, Thankful,

and Faithful Paſtor and Servant,

THO. TENISON.

An

An *Extract* out of the Last Will of the Reverend Mr. *HERBERT THORNDIKE*, sign'd, *&c. July* 3. 1672. and prov'd the *same year* and month.

—But my Will is, That if my said Nieces, or either of them, shall return to New-England, after my Decease, or shall marry with any that goes to Mass, or any of the New Licens'd Conventicles, then whatsoever is given them by this my Will, exceeding the 400. l. which I have absolutely given them by Deed, shall be void, and not due; So that when either, or both of them shall be married here to such as sincerely cleave to the Church of England, then the payment to be made, &c.

As for my Body, *I charge my Executor to write these Words upon my Grave-stone:* Hic jacet Corpus *HERBERTI THORNDIKE*, Prebendarii hujus Ecclesiæ, Qui vivus veram Reformandæ Ecclesiæ Rationem ac Modum precibusq; studiisq; prosequebatur. Tu, Lector, Requiem ei & beatam in Christo Resurrectionem precare.

THE

CONTENTS.

CHap. 1. *Mr.* A. Pulton, *Jeſuit, conſider'd in his Certificates.* Page 1.

Chap. 2. *Mr.* A. P. *conſider'd in an Artifice uſed by him in his* TRUE *and* FULL ACCOUNT, *with a like Inſtance, relating to Dr.* Hammond, p. 7.

Chap. 3. *Mr.* P's *Reaſonings and Authorities conſidered and refuted; and firſt in Relation to his Charge againſt* Luther, p. 17.

Chap. 4. *Mr.* P's *Objections againſt the Rule of Faith, ſhown to be weak and unconvincing,* p. 33.

Chap. 5. *Mr.* P. *conſider'd with relation to what he hath ſaid about the* Lateran *Council,* p. 58.

Chap. 6. *Mr.* P. *conſider'd in relation to what he has ſaid touching the Antiquity of Popery in* England, p. 61.

Chap. 7. *Mr.* P. *conſider'd in his Accuſations,* p. 67.

Chap. 8. *Mr.* P. *conſider'd in his Triumphs,* p. 93.

Chap. 9. *Mr.* P. *conſider'd in his Threatnings,* p. 96.

The Concluſion. p. 97.

CHAP.

CHAP. I.

Mr. Pulton *consider'd in his Certificates.*

THE *Jesuit* has usher'd in his *Second Pamphlet* with a pompous Company of **Testimonials**; With Testimonies in **Favour** of *A. P.* A new stile in *Certificates*, which ought to be written, either without *Fear*, *Affection*, or **Favour**. There was as little necessity for *any* of them, as there is sincerity in *some*. For I affirm'd, from very good Evidence, That several Persons enter'd with him; but I repeated it in the Second Page of my Account, that I did not say *they were all of Mr.* Pulton's *bringing*. Nor did I affirm there was one *Jesuit* there besides himself: For certainly *all Orders* are not swallow'd up in *his*, how widely soever he may open for that purpose.

I do not dispute either the *L. S. J*'s, or the *Provincial*'s Certificate; but if others under his Obedience have the like *Sincerity* with Mr. *Pulton*, they may have been there, without saying they were so, as well as *Katharine Lamb* might not at first be there, yet say she was.

Well; his false *Quotations* will not be swallow'd, and now his Refuge is *Certificates*. But they have likewise fail'd him. And he that reads the *following Testimonies*, and enquires after the Integrity of those who subscrib'd them,

them, and the Capacity they have been in of knowing the Truth; and considers the little Reason they have had to expose themselves to the ill will of many, if their love of Truth would have suffer'd them to be private: Such a person (I say) for the *buying of Truth*, will not be apt to go to Mr. *Pulton* to purchase it. And when our Disputant lays his hand upon his heart, and reflects in Christian manner upon this insincerity, he will (I hope) make a more open acknowledgment for a publick Scandal, than an Auricular Confession can amount to. And let him henceforth forbear his Raillery about **Katharine Boren**, lest he put people in mind of **Katharine Lamb**. This *Katharine Lamb*, for ought I know, may be a vertuous and true Woman. But as *She* is represented in Mr. *Pulton's Certificate*, she is a very extraordinary person. Certainly she must have some Relation to that Famous Dr. *Lamb*, whom the *Mobile* believ'd to be a *Conjurer:* For to be in a Room kept on purpose private, by Mrs. *R.* till D. *T.* and Mr. *Pulton* should come in, and neither to be seen by her or him; or, in her passage, by any of the Family; if it has nothing in it of one *Black Art*, I'm sure in the telling it, it has something of *another*. If she was there, she must have come in by some unsuspected way, such as the Chimney, or the Key-hole: And if there she remain'd, she must have put her self into the shape of some such thing as a Table, a Chair, or a Candlestick.

This *Long-Acre Miracle* will not pass, nor make many Conversions. For the People understand, that if **Katharine Lamb** did not certifie this, there's *Forgery* in it; and if she did, there is *False Evidence*. Now this, as our Representer pleases to speak, of a *Query*, (*a*) is *a Horned Beast* of an Argument. It is a curst *Dilemma*, which hath

(*a*) Mr. P's Acm. *p.* 35.

hath long Horns, and let him take heed that they do not push him.

But let us see what Mr. *Pulton* himself says to this matter; for he is an Artist at mending a business, by making more holes in it. On *Novemb.* the 4*th* he Publish'd his *Remarks*. That Night the false Certificate of *Katharina in Nubibus*, was publickly expos'd. This came to his Ear, and it was, no doubt, as welcome to him as the *next days History*. On the Lord's day following, in the Afternoon (the better the day, the worse the deed), he closes his Sermon with this *Jargon*, not deliver'd without a *Concern* in his *Looks*, and *Disorder* in his *Voice*.

"I was *mistaken* this Week in one thing of my last Pa-
"per, which, tho true, yet I had it not from the person's
"own hand, tho it came as if it came from them: It is
"about one of the Evidences, or Testimonials, which I
"shall clear by a *Printed Paper* to morrow, and satisfie
"therein about it The thing I say is true, but the Evi-
"dence not made by the Person to me, tho it came as from
"their own hands. But I shall give an account of it to-
"morrow by a *Printed Paper*.

Now commend me to the Infallible man, who *was thus mistaken*; to the man who will be plain in nothing relating to me. *He* is the man in the World who is good at a *Conclusion*. He is that Wise man in my Lord *Bacon's Essays*, who reserves his great business for a *Postscript*.

He is concern'd in a false way; let him neither dance, nor dance in a Net; for he is seen through his Cover, and he shews his halting as often as he stirs.

As to the *Famous Paper* he promis'd to publish the very next day, with such Solemnity; no Person, that I can hear of, has ever yet beheld it, tho inquiry after it has not been wanting.

And

And now I have greater Compaſſion than ever for deluded *J. S.* for he hapned upon a man, who, if he is a Lover of Truth, has a very notable Art in concealing his Affection.

IMPARTIAL CERTIFICATES relating to the CONFERENCE betwixt Mr. A. P. *and* D. T.

WE Inhabitants of the Pariſh of St. *Martin* in the Fields, in the County of *Middleſex*, and others, whoſe Names are ſubſcribed, Do hereby certifie, That *Robert Uppington*, of *Long-Acre*, in the ſaid Pariſh, *Braſier*, is a Perſon of Honeſty and Integrity; and, during his abode there, has lived peaceably, orderly, and in good Eſteem amongſt his Neighbours. Witneſs Our Hands the 11*th* day of *November*, 1687.

Richard Rider, *William Cleer*, *William Thompſon*, *John Roydhous*, *Edward Salisbury*, *Chriſtopher Cock*, *Robert Wood*, *Benjamin Thody*.

Novemb. 4*th*, 1687.

WHereas in a Book this day publiſhed by Mr. *Pulton*, School-Maſter in the *Savoy*, there is this following Certificate inſerted; *viz.*

Being in the Chamber where the Conference was held, I ſaw Mr. Pulton *come up with only one Gentleman in his Company, and a third perſon, who followed them. Witneſs, my Hand,*

Cath. Lamb.

Now

Now this is to Certifie, That I was in my own Chamber (being the place where the Conference was held) when Mr. *Pulton* came up, with his Train following him (who ſhall be named when there is occaſion): And that no Woman, or any other Perſon (beſides Dr. *Teniſon* and my ſelf), was there at that time. Witneſs my Hand, the *4th* of *November*, 1687.

Suſanna Robinſon.

WE living in the ſame Houſe, and ſeeing what perſons came in, Do certifie, That (beſides Dr. *Teniſon*) no Perſon went into Mrs. *Robinſon*'s Chamber, till Mr. *Pulton* entered with his Company. Witneſs our Hands,

Anna Uppington.
Sarah Wood.

I Do certifie, That during the time of the Conference, ſeveral Gentlemen came to the Door, and importuned me to let them in, telling me, Mr. *Pulton* had appointed them to meet him there at Three of the Clock. Witneſs my Hand,

A true Copy, *Sarah Wood.*

I Do (in Relation to the Teſtimony of the *L. S. J.*) Certifie, That Three Perſons came to my Houſe at the Conference, and preſſed to come in; and one of them asking me, if I did not know him? and I anſwering, I did not, ſaid, he belonged to the *L. S. J.* and came from thence. And that it was never ſuggeſted, that one of them was the *L. S. J.* Prieſt; for then it would not have been ſaid, *a Perſon ſuppoſed to be a Prieſt*, by reaſon the *L. S. J.* Prieſt is known to the Neighbourhood; and I believe (having never heard the contrary) that he has been civilly uſed by them. Witneſs my Hand the *11th* Day of *November*, 1687.

Robert Uppington.

I Do Certifie, That I have been to acquaint the L. *S. J.* of the persons coming to my House, and one of them saying, he belonged to her: But she being with Company, I told the same to some of her Servants. Witness my Hand the 11*th* Day of *November*, 1687.

Anna Uppington.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

An Artifice *in Mr.* Pulton's *Second Narrative detected, together with an Inſtance of the like Artifice practis'd in relation to Dr.* Hammond.

CUrſory Notes have already been made both upon the *Jeſuit's* True; and his True and Full Account: And I do not yet ſee any great Reaſon given by him for the blotting out of a ſingle line. Something, however, may be added, ſeeing he has been pleas'd to make both Additions and Alterations. He has added an Advertiſement, and a Preface; and in both of them he is a pleaſant man. In his Advertiſement he excuſes his falſe *Engliſh*, by his having been Eighteen Years out of *England*; And yet he can write *two Engliſh* Books in a few Weeks, and in one of them, uſe *three* ſeveral Stiles. I do not enquire whereabouts he has liv'd: one would think by his *Narratives* and *Certificates*, that he has liv'd among the Cretians. But ſeeing he ſpeaks *Engliſh* as readily as any man, it may reaſonably be demanded, how, in his Travels, a man of his *Profeſſion*, retains the *Pronunciation*, and loſes the *Grammar* of his Native Language? Now, perceiving that the *Printers* are become Criticks in the *Engliſh* Tongue, he ſends me a Challenge to diſpute with him in Latin. Latin, it ſeems, is ſo belov'd a Language, that he chuſes to have both *Prayers* and *Conferences* in that Tongue, for the Edification of the People; for certainly the Learned have no need of our aſſiſtance; I fear we may rather become their ſport.

After this, our Champion advanceth with his **Preface**, and there he imitates the ruggider Duelliſts, who, without any Embraces, make fierce paſſes at one another.

He accuſes me of **Miſtakes**, and **Miſrepreſentations**, and want of *Sincerity*, not thinking of his own guilt, whilſt he traduces his Neighbour. Nay, I am become ſo potent in theſe Arts, that I have confounded the whole matter, *and truly* (*a*) *inverted* the **whole Order** of the *Conference*. I have done a wondrous thing in repreſenting that as Confuſion which was ſo: By whoſe means, the unbyaſs'd can tell.

(*a*) M. *P*'s True and full Account. Ep. to the Reader.

But what, if in the little method that was us'd, Mr. *P.* himſelf ſhould be the man who has *inverted the Order*? Why then, he wants either *Memory* or *Sincerity*.

Now after having ſpoken of the Words of St. *Ambroſe*, he introduces the ſtory of *Luther*, and the Courtezans. This was mention'd at the beginning, and St. *Ambroſe* towards the end. And if the ſetting of the laſt firſt, and the firſt laſt, be Order, Mr. *P.* is a man of Method, and no *Inverter*. But perhaps it was in him a Point of Good Manners, to ſet St. *Ambroſe* before *Luther*, and let it go ſo. Of this true Relation he ſays, that D. *T. recounted he knows not what Story of ſome Prieſt at* Rome. And yet the Story is told as plainly as a Story can be told, and it needs no Interpreter. He is a ſingular man: He will neither tell a thing plainly himſelf, nor underſtand another that does ſo. He goes on, and informs the World (for it is informing), That I was (*b*) *offering at another long paſſage in* Luther's *Works*; and yet it was a Story out of the *Acts* of his beloved *Second Synod* of *Nice*, as ſet forth by the *Jeſuites Labbe* and *Coſſart*. If the *Jeſuites* Collection of Councils, and Popes Epiſtles and Decrees, be *Luther*'s Works, the *Lutherans* and *Romans* are in a marvellous *accommodation*,

(*b*) M. *P*'s Full Account, *p.* 11.

commodation, which none of them know of. This is a Diſcovery worthy the invention of the *inviſible Catharine*. But why is my *I know not what Story of a Prieſt*, ſo very idle? He gives a falſe Account of *Luther*'s leaving the *Maſs*, and I requite him with a true one. He from *Luther*'s bitter Adverſaries, and I from *Luther* himſelf. The Proteſtants thought it not at all amiſs, that I ſhould give him an *Allen* for his *Duncomb*.

But, to come to his *Artifice*. He ſends me his *Second Narrative* in Writing. He expects my *Notes* upon it. He deſires, in order to his eaſier finding of my Objections, that I will obſerve the Numbers of his Paragraphs (*b*). I do this little Service for him. I ſend him my *Account* and *Notes* in Print, on *Wedneſday*. My Man carries a Book to him, before he brings one either into my own Houſe, or Pariſhes. He reads theſe words in it, (*a*) *Obſerve here the Fidelity either of Mr.* P's *Memory, or his Conſcience.* "He, ſays the Dr. told a Story of ſome Prieſt at *Rome*, "who having pronounced the Words of Conſecration, "was heard to ſay aloud, That he believed not as the "*Roman* Church obliged. Whereas the Story, as be- "fore repeated, was about the Courtezans over-hearing "the Prieſt ſay, *Bread thou art, and Bread thou ſhalt* "*be*, &c.

(*b*) See his Letter here publiſhed, *chap.* 7.

(*a*) D[illegible] &c. p. 82. Parag. 17, 18.

Notwithſtanding this, without any notice given me, or any acknowledgment in either of his Books, he (beſides many other Variations, not ſo material) makes in Print, this alteration from the *MS.* he ſent me: "He recounted I "know not what Story of ſome Prieſt at *Rome*, who pro- "nouncing the words of Conſecration, was heard to ſay, "*Bread thou art, and Bread thou ſhalt be; Wine thou* "*art*, &c.

To what end do you imagine is this Alteration made without giving any notice? Is it not that Readers obſerving

ving *first* the Words I cite, as *his*, and then perusing his *Account*, and finding in it, that I tax him with failure in Memory, or in Conscience, may be induc'd to think I *falsifie*? Some who came to me, pleas'd to use the freedom, for which I thank them, and to ask how this could come about? I show'd them the *Account* in *MS.* which Mr. *Pulton* sent me, and compar'd it with the Account which he had Printed, and they were satisfied about the *truth* and *fullness* of his Narrative. He had better have left a void space in his Story, than have fill'd it with things which should not have been put in.

But he must not arrogate to himself this Artifice: It is an old Invention; and I am going about to give a Remarkable Instance of it in the case of the *Reverend*, the *Learned*, and (that for which I most esteem him) the Pious Dr. *Hammond*. He had cited a Passage out of Mr. *White*; the Leaf was cut out, and another pasted in; and then the Dr. was charg'd by his Adversary *W. S.* with falsifying a Quotation. I will give you this in Dr. *Hammond*'s own Words, both that it may not rest upon my slender Authority, and that People may see it without the trouble of buying a great Book, not in every hand (*a*).

(*a*) Dr. *H. H.* Works. Vol. 2. at the end of his Dispatcher dispatch'd, or Third Defence of his Book of Schism, against *S. W.* p. 253, 415.

NOTE. This *S. W.* has been generally supposed to be the same Person with *J. S.* who at this present writes the Pamphlets call'd the *Catholick Letters*.

Dr.

Dr. *Hammond*'s own Relation, entitled, *A Brief Account of one Suggeſtion of the* Romaniſt.

1 IT is the Statesman's Maxim concerning a false Suggestion, That if it be believed but Four and Twenty Hours, the Value of it is inestimable, which tho it must be allow'd to receive a grand Abatement, when it is apply'd to inferiour, and less considerable Transactions; yet the Interests of Religion, in the maintenance of Truth, are not so dispisable, as that he that hath appear'd, or embarked in them, can safely neglect the advantages which evil Arts may yield, or furnish an Adversary against him.

2. Such in Reason, and in Experience, beyond all others, is the Charge of *falsifying*; which if it be but suggested, and believed of any, and much more if a pregnant and visible Proof of it be tender'd, there needs no other Blast, or Smut, or Vermine, to lay waste the whole Field, and deprive him of all Harvest of his Seed and Labours.

3. How this is my Concernment at this time, the Reader will not suddenly divine, till I have entertain'd him with a short Relation of that which I had rather my self *proclaim* on the *House-top*, than leave others to whisper it in *Corners*.

4. I was lately advertised by a Judicious and Reverend Friend, that it was particularly urged against me, by a *Romaniſt*, That I had mistaken, or perverted Mr. *White*'s Words, which I refer to, in *The Dispatcher Dispatch'd*, Chap. 3. Sect. 4. *p.* 279. where I suppose him to answer (in his Apology for Tradition, *p.* 56.), That the Beatifical Vision of the Saints, before the Day of Judgment, was not yet held a mat-

matter of Faith, but only a Theological Concluſion; when (ſaid he) the Apology in that very place, had expreſly ſaid, "That this Point is a matter of Faith, grounded on Tradition, and not a Theological Concluſion.

5. That I ſhould be guilty, of but of ſuch an Oſcitancy, or Miſtake, much more of ſuch a vile perverſion as this, I may be allow'd to have been as unwilling my ſelf to believe, as I am oblig'd to take care, that others ſhould not cauſleſly apprehend it of me: Therefore without delay, I turn'd firſt to mine own Words (which as I then could not doubt, ſo now I acknowledge to be faithfully related), then to Mr. *White*'s Words, in the Page of his Apology, whence I had cited them; and thoſe I found exactly, and to a Letter concordant to my Tranſcript of them, in the *Diſpatcher Diſpatch'd*.

6. For thus I ſtill read (if I will not at Noon-day ſuſpect mine own Eyes) in that Apologiſt, *p.* 56. *l.* 12. [*For nothing is more clear, than that the Validity of Baptiſm by Hereticks was a Tradition, and decided by it: So the Beatifical Viſion of the Saints, before the Day of Judgment, the Spirituality of Angels, are not yet held matters of Faith, but only Theological Concluſions, as likewiſe the Souls being concreated to the perfecting of the Body.*] What can be more manifeſt, than that in this Period *the Beatifical Viſion of Saints, before the Day of Judgment*, is by that Apologiſt ſet down, as one of the two things (to which after a third is ſubjoin'd) of which it is affirm'd in the Plural, that they *are not yet held matters of Faith, but only Theological Concluſions?* Which was all to a Syllable that I cited from him in that place, with this only change, that ſpeaking only of *one* of theſe, *the Beatifical Viſion*, &c. I ſet it (as it was neceſſary) in the Singular, *is not yet held a matter of Faith, but only a Theological Concluſion.*

7. That I might be ſure not to have miſtaken my Author, I carefully conſulted the *Errata*, but there was none noted, relating to that Page: And indeed the whole Compoſure of the Period was ſuch, that there muſt be a concurrence of

very

very many changes in the compaſs of very few lines (more, I believe, than the moſt negligent Compoſitor and Corrector have at any time conſpir'd to be guilty of), to wreſt this Teſtimony from me, or change it into what this *Romaniſt* had affirmed it to be.

8. Having diſpatch'd this account to my Friend, from whom I received the former Advertiſement, I had no cauſe of doubt, but that this affair had received its full Period, the *Romaniſt* being obliged to yeild to ſuch full uncontrollable Evidence, and every man's Eyes, to whom the contrary Suggeſtion could be offered, being as well qualify'd as mine, to ſecure him from being miſled by it. And on theſe grounds of ſafety I had *no leaſt* thought of troubling the Reader with any Account, or Complaint, which I now ſee is become ſome part of my Intereſt and my Duty.

9. For I was ſoon aſſured by my Friend, that the Words which I had punctually tranſcribed from my Copy of the Apology, were not to be found in that which he had before him, but quite transformed into the contrary ſenſe, even that for which the *Romaniſt* had vouch'd them: For thus he found them [*for nothing is more clear, than that the Validity of Baptiſm by Hereticks, was a Tradition, and decided by it: So the Beatifical Viſion of the Saints, before the Day of Judgment. The Spirituality of Angels is not yet held a matter of Faith, but only a Theological Concluſion.*]

10. By this Repreſentation I was ſoon forced to confeſs, That the whole Scene was changed, the firſt part of the Words remaining the ſame, but the ſecond [*of the Beatifical Viſion of the Saints*] which were my only Concernment, wholly transform'd; that which before was join'd with the *Spirituality of Angels, as not yet held matters of Faith, but only Theological Concluſions*, being now annex'd to the *Validity of Baptiſm by Hereticks*, and ſo affirm'd to be a Tradition (and that is with him a matter of Faith), and decided by it: And then I had Reaſon to acknowledge

the Candour of that *Romanist*, who proceeding on these Appearances, had laid no heavier a Censure upon me, than that of *either mistaking, or perverting* Mr. *White's Words.*

11. In this new posture of Affairs, first it was presently discernable, That the very many Changes, which I had foreseen, had been really made, to bring this about. And as all this was obvious, and credible to be done by a new Edition of the Book; so it remained uncertain to me, whether mine, or that other so contrary to it, were the True and Authentick Edition: This therefore was my next care to examine.

12. And herein again I met with an Intricacy; For if the Title-Pages, and a Concurrence of all obvious Indications, might be believed, there was all this while but one Edition; both Copies carrying in their Front, *A Paris, chez Jean Billain Rue S. Jacques à l'ensign S. Austin*, 1654. the same Volume, Print, Number of Pages, beginning and end of every Page, *&c.* This soon suggested that which was the only clue to extricate me then (and the Reader now) out of this Labyrinth. For sending to the *Stationers* for another Copy of the Apology, as from one, I received a Copy perfectly agreeing with mine, so by the help of another, I was furnish't with one exactly accordant to what my Monitor, from the *Romanist*, had represented to me, yet not discernably differing from my own in any other, save in this one Passage; and looking more narrowly, first, the Paper and Ink, wherein that Leaf was Printed (discernibly differing from all the rest of the Book), was apt to inject some suspicion: But I soon saw that I had no need of this, or other obscurer intimation, it being grosly visible, that in this place a Leaf had been cut out, and a new one pasted in. And what Gordian Knot might not have been untied by the like instrument?

13. When

13. When this change was thought fit to be made, I did, and ſtill want Augury to divine; only this is apparent, that it was a Work which Second thoughts ſuggeſted, after the Book was publiſhed; elſe my Copy, which came regularly to me from the *Worceſter Stationer* (in the Year, if my Memory fail me not, 1655.) and another now ſent me from another *Stationer* (which aſſures me, there be many more) muſt have had their parts in the Change.

14. Having given the Reader a brief and ſingle view of this matter, I abſtain from any farther Obſervation, or Reflection on it, than what a

Quo teneam vultus mutantem ——— ?

will amount to. But that is alſo unneceſſary, my whole Deſign being compleated in this, That it is now manifeſt to the moſt imperſwaſible of their Diſciples, that dare read what is written againſt their Maſters (which I perceive few are permitted to do), That I neither miſtook, nor perverted the Apologiſt's Senſe or Words, thoſe, I mean, which I read in his Book, from which alone I could be imagined to receive cognizance of them, not being able to forecaſt, that what I had thus really tranſcrib'd from him, would be ſo ſoon ſnatch't from me again, or that what was to me ſo viſible, ſhould vaniſh, and become inviſible to other men.

15. This indeed is an unexpected Proof of what *S. W.* had told me concerning the Wits (enormous) Power to transform Teſtimonies; which yet ſhall not diſcourage me from dealing in that Ware (being firmly reſolved never to make uſe of my duller Faculties, to work ſuch Metamorphoſes), nor yet from diverting ſometimes into ſuch pleaſant Fields, adorned with ſo great Varieties, as that Apologiſt frequently affords the World, hoping that I ſhall not again meet with ſuch miſadventures as theſe, or any

greater interruptions in reading him, than what a competent Attention, and a Table of *Errata*, shall enable me to overcome.

16. This Account, I conceived, would more pardonably, because more moderately, divert the Reader at this time, than if I should stay till it were solemnly and articulately call'd for, and moreover, deliver *S. W.* from some temptation, himself to think, or to perswade others, that he had sprang some real Game to invite his Chases, some Guilt to support his Contumelies, and perhaps prevail with some of their most credulous followers, to think it equitable to subject the Suggestions they meet with, to some other ways of Examination and Trial, than the bare Authority or Confidence of the Suggesters.

THE END.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

Mr. Pulton's *Chief Reasonings and Authorities consider'd and refuted. And here first of his Reasonings and Authorities about* Luther.

MR. *Pulton's* Chief Reasonings and Authorities may be consider'd, in relation,

1. To *Luther.*
2. To the Rule of Faith.
3. To the *Lateran* Council.
4. To the Antiquity of Popery in *England.*

1. For Luther he has rais'd up the Ghost of Mr. *John Brerely*, *Priest*, for the encountring of the celebrated *Dæmon* of *Martin* (*a*). And tho he was in the Conference, referr'd to a late unanswered Book, called, *The Spirit of* Martin Luther, yet he will take no notice of it, but bring up the *Old Objections*, and by Repetition attempt that which he cannot do by *Argument.*

(*a*) *J. B's* Life of *Luther. S. Omers* 1624. *p.* 17, 29, 39, 44, 52, *&c.*

Now the most material part of that which he *certifies*, not in favour of *Luther*, may be reduc'd to *Six Heads*, that the *rambling* (*b*) which he complains of, and at the same time is guilty of, may be avoided. He will by no means,

(*b*) Mr. P's Full Account. *p.* 11.

means grant (even after grains of allowance for humane infirmity, for Monkish Education, for the Darkness and Abuses of those times, for Natural Temper, for highest provocations to be *rugged* with the *rugged*), that *Luther* was an *excellent instrument of God.*

1. Because he express'd his Passion against the word *Homousion.*
2. Because he spake irreverently of *Ecclesiastes.*
3. Because he spake indecently about Marriage.
4. Because he spake with disrespect of *Henry* the Eighth.
5. Because he disgusted the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, upon Conversation with Courtizans.
6. Because he left the *Mass* upon the perswasion of the Devil.

Now I will *first* tell Mr. *P.* one of my Reasons in *justice to Luther*, and then consider his.

My Reason is this: God used *Luther* as an Instrument of bringing forth the *Bible* from under that Rubbish of *Canonists* and *Schoolmen*, which had hid it from the World. The *Roman Doctors* did not put the *Bible* into *Luther's* Hands, but he found it by God's Providence, in a Library, where he look'd not for it. There was need of that *Light* in so ignorant and ill an Age, in which Tales (even *Fables not cunningly devised*) were Printed and Re-printed in the *Vulgar Tongue* (in which the true Scriptures were not to be had), and call'd by the Name of **Flowers** out of the **Bible**. If *One Example* be produc'd, it will be enough

enough for a Reader, who has not abated of his due Veneration for the most Sacred Word of God (*a*).

(*a*) Fioreti de la Bibia Vulgari Historiati, &c. Novamente stampati in Milano. C. 170. An. 1524.

Fu un di che Joseph *dovea far una letera a un Valente huomo, & si guardo el legname perche volea far quella letera, & trovo curto uno cavo piu che l'altro, & fu molto turbato per che non haveva el legname ala misura, & Jesu veniva di fora da solazo conli fanciulli, e entro in casa e trovo* Joseph *cruciato perche elli non havea trovato, el legname sufficiente, & Jesu disse a* Joseph *non havere malinconia dicendo che lui pigliasse da un capo, e luy pigliare be da l'altro, & tanto tirono, che el legname fu longo come bisognava, & vedendo* Joseph *che el legname stava bene; benedisse el nome de Dio & in quello tempo fini Jesu 7 anni.*

It was upon a Day that *Joseph* was to make a Bedstead for a Worthy Man; and so looking upon the Wood, of which he designed to make the Bedstead, he found one side shorter than the other, and was much troubled, because he had not Wood according to the measure; And Jesus came from abroad from his Play with the Boys, and enter'd into the House; and found *Joseph* very much troubled, because he had not found the Wood sufficient: And Jesus bad *Joseph* not to be melancholick, saying, That he should take hold on one end, and himself would take hold on the other; and they pull'd so much, that the Wood was as long as was needful; And *Joseph* seeing that the Wood was fit, blessed the Name of God. And at this time Jesus had finished the 7*th* Year of his Age.

This

This is one of my Reaſons for him; his being an Inſtrument of bringing better Scripture into the Peoples Hands. Let ſome of Mr. *Pulton*'s Reaſons be laid in the Ballance againſt this One, that we may ſee how heavy they are.

Object. 1. "My Soul (ſaith *Luther*) hates *Homouſion*, "and the *Arians* did very well in expelling it, leſt ſo "prophane and new a word ſhould be us'd in the Articles "of Faith (*a*).

(*a*) Mr. *P*'s Rem. *p.* 8.

Anſwer. If he lik'd not the Word (as he ſays (*b*) St. *Hierom* himſelf did not), he approv'd of the Article (*c*), as all *Lutherans* do, and it is the firſt we meet with, in the *Confeſſion* of *Wirtemburg* (*d*). But what if Mr. *P.* has not cited *Luther* faithfully? Why then his Hand is ſtill in at **Falſe Quotations**. For his Words are not, *My Soul hates*, &c. but, *Quod ſi odit anima mea vocem Homouſion, & volò eâ uti, non ero Hæreticus*, ——*but if, or upon ſuppoſition that* my *Soul hates the Word* Homouſion, *and I refuſe to uſe it, I ſhall not, (or will not) be a Heretick.* This falſe Quotation was uſed by *Bellarmine* himſelf *, whom many have in ſuch admiration, that without examining, they tranſcribe his very Faults; and make that to be *abſolutely*, which was *conditionally* ſpoken. *Luther* was not pleas'd with this Word, neither did he, with St. *Hierom*, like the Word *Hypoſtaſis*; but the Doctrine he taught. And *Chemnitius* and *Gerard* inform us, that he was not pleas'd with the Word *Trinity*, becauſe in the *German* Tongue it ſeemed to import rather Triplicity than Trinity.

(*b*) *Luth.* contra Latom. —— Homouſion quod & Hieronymus optavit *aboleri*.

(*c*) *Luth.* cont. Latom. —— Etſi Ariani malè ſenſerunt in fide, hoc tamen optimè ſive malo ſive bono animo exegerunt, ne vocem profanam & Novam in Regulis fidei uſurpare liceret.

* Bell. Pref. ad Lde Chr. *p.* 227. M. L. contra Jac. Latomum Scribens, Anima mea, inquit, odit hoc verbum ὁμοούσιος.

Object.

Object. 2. *Eccleſiaſtes* (ſays *Luther*) has never a "perfect Sentence, (a) the Author had neither Boots "nor Spurs, but rid on a long Stick, or in begging "Shoes, as he did when he was a Fryer. (a) Mr. P's Rem. p. 8.

Anſwer. This is cited not from *Luther*'s true Works, but from a Book called *Luther's Table-talk*, which, if he were alive, he would not own, and which is of no Authority with any judicious Man. Let ſuch a Man look into the Commentary of *Luther* upon *Eccleſiaſtes*: There he will find him highly commending that * wiſe Book, and explaining its notion of the contempt of the World againſt thoſe who (as he ſays) miſtake *Sordidneſs* for *Religion*.

* L. Op. Tom. 3. *fol.* 231. Liber multis nominibus dignus qui omnium manibus tereretur, *fol.* 232. — Relig. causâ ſordidiſſimè victitârunt. —— Neq; enim contemnit felicitèr mundum qui vivit ſolitarius —— at qui abſtinet à pecuniis, ut Franciſcani, ſed qui in mediis rebus verſatur, neq; tamen earum affectibus rapitur.

Object. 3. *As it is not in my Power* (ſaith *Luther*) *that I ſhould be no Man* (b), *ſo it is not in my Power that I ſhould be without a Woman.* (b) Mr. P's Rem. p. 9, 10.

Anſwer. This (with other ſuch ſayings) is but leſs decent expreſſing of that which St. *Paul* deliver'd in more tender Language, in that very wiſe Caſuiſtical Sentence, *It is better to marry than to burn.* *Luther* (poſſibly) had not ſpoken of the neceſſity of Marriage in ſuch plain terms, if he had not been oppoſed by thoſe who urg'd Monaſtick Vows, and held the *Marriage* of the Clergy to be *diſhonourable* and unlawful. The Spirit of *Luther* might be moved upon obſervation of unchaſt Celibacy. There has been too much of that *out of the World*, as well as *in it*. Otherwiſe what need would there have been

(for instance sake) of the Constitution of Cardinal *Gallon* (c) forbidding, so much as *MOTHERS* to have Domestick Conversation with *Priests*; and adding as a reason, that *tho so foul a Crime is against Nature, yet notwithstanding, frequently through the suggestion of the Devil, that* Wickedness is known to have been, even with SUCH, committed. It seems the *Devil* and *Luther* have not been the only *Familiars*.

(c) Conc. & Decr. Synod. S. Rotomag. Eccles. Const. Gall. Capitul. 1. p. 209. Moneantur quoq; ne MATRES vel Uxores, aliasq; conjunctas personas secum habeant, cum quibus etsi nihil sævi criminis fœdus naturale existimari permittat, tamen frequenter, suggerente Diabolo, cum talibus nosci tur fuisse facinus perpetratum.

(d) Mr. P's Rem. p. 11.

Object. 4. *Luther* (d) calls *Henry* the VIII. more furious than Madness it self, more foolish than Folly it self, &c. most wicked and *impudent Harry*; and again, thou liest in thy Throat, foolish and sacrilegious King.

Answ. This is one of the *Grains* to be allow'd to *Luther*. However, it is capable of a Retort against them, tho not of a defence in the nature of the thing it self. *They* call *Hen.* VIII. sacrilegious, but *Luther* must not. *Lucifer Calaritanus* calls *Constantius* most *impudent Emperour* *.

* Pro S. Athan. l. 1. p. 25.

It is noted in Commendation of St. *Athanasius* by a *deposing Author* (e), that he often in one Epistle stiles *Constantius* the *Procursour of Antichrist*. If such ill Language was a Crime in *Luther*, it was certainly so in *them*, they being those Emperours Subjects.

(e) J. E. *Right of the Prelati and the Prince*, p. 144. *imprinted with Licens from Superiours*, Anno 1621.

The Romanists and Latiniz'd Greeks revile *Constantine*, and miscall him *Copronymus*, he being an Enemy to the Worship of Images: But in *Luther* all ill Names are unsufferable. They reprove not the Jesuit *BELLARMIN*, for reviling King *JAMES THE FIRST*, and asserting that he could not upon any account

account he excuſed from *HERESY (f)*. But if *Luther* touches a Prince with an undutiful Tongue, he is ſtraightway of as black a Mouth as *Satan* his *Familiar*. *GRETZER* the *Jeſuit* (the ſame *Gretzer* whoſe Grammar Mr. *Pulton* uſes) is not reproved, yet he begins his Book with theſe Contents of his *firſt Chapter*. *That the Faith which King* James *profeſſeth, and defendeth, IS NOT TRVLT CHRISTIAN (g)*. But if *Luther* utters any frothy words, they are all poyſonous, and he is run mad, and wo to every Man that ſtands in his way. *J. S.* has a Letter framed for him, of which the latter part was written in Mr. *Pulton*'s own Hand *(h)*: And in that Letter he is taught to revile King *Henry* the VIII, by the name of *Leacher*. This has been obſerv'd to Mr. *P.* but ſtill he goes on, and rebukes *Luther* for ſuch ill Manners as he himſelf is a Teacher of. And here with ſincere, not *hypocritical Charity (i)* I pity *J. S.* who has had ſuch ill Example ſet him, both of Falſhood and Incivility. His Crime was the leſs, that he copied and did not invent. God pardon and amend him.

(f) Apol. R. Bellar. pro Reſp. ſuâ ad L. Jac. M. B. Regis, *&c. Cap.* 7. *p.* 98. Jac. Regem ab Hæreſi excuſari nullâ ratione poſſe.

(g) Jac. Gretſeri Soc. Jeſ. Comment. exeget. *Ingolſtad.* 1610. *t.* 1. *p.* 13.

(h) *D. T's Account, p.* 71.

(i) *Mr. P's Rem. p.* 32. *The Charity D. T. hypocritically pretends to.*

Object. 5. *Luther* learned, " That Conſecrated " Bread was ſtill Bread, not from the Colledg *(k)* of " Cardinals, Biſhops, and Prelats —— but from the " very Courtizans. —— And here the Doctor has " unawares pointed us out the true Motive of *Lu-* " *ther*'s Change of Life and Doctrine, *viz.* the Con- " verſation of Courtizans; which he knew, being " ~~a *Fryer*, he could not eaſily~~ enjoy.

(k) *Mr. P's Rem. p.* 13.

Anſwer. I had thought they had been then connived at at *Rome*: For the ſtate of the ſingle, and not

the married. But however we have here another Instance of Mr. *PULTON's SINCERITY, D. T.* had thus reported that Story from *Luther*, and from the *Writer* of his Life *(l)*. *He had been at* Rome, *and said Mass there, and heard it said*, and he *took notice* of the *PROFANENESS* of the *MASS-PRIESTS*, and he *OVER-HEARD the very Courtizans jeeringly say, that some who consecrated, had used these words, Bread thou art, and Bread thou shalt be, Wine thou art, and Wine thou shalt be.* This Story sticks in Mr. *Pulton*'s side, but as yet he never would rightly repeat it. Sometimes it is, *I know not what Story (m) of a Priest that was heard to say aloud, that he believed not as the Roman Church obliged.* Now *Luther* learn'd it only from the *Courtizans*, tho he said he himself *took notice* of the *Profaneness* of the *Mass-Priests*. But here again his Dexterity in equivocating can fetch him off; for the Mass-Priests were not *Cardinals*, *Bishops*, or *Prelats*.

(l) D. T's Account, p. 8.

(m) Mr. P's MS. Account.

But his *main Point* is that of *LUTHER* and the *DEVIL*, with *that* he began with *J. S. that* he pursued, and *that* he will not part with.

Whether his Affection to that Fable will permit him to part with it, is not a very material Inquiry. It seems as dear to him as *Katherina in the Clouds*. But I am apt to believe that the impartial will dismiss it upon due attention to that which follows.

A Confutation of Mr. Cordemoy's *Book, written upon the* CONFERENCE OF LUTHER WITH THE DEVIL. *By* Gaspar Sagittarius (a).

(a) Nov. de la Rep. des Lettres. Janv. 1687. p. 32, &c.

THE Author pretends, that the Jesuits of *Germany* first began to wrangle, upon this *Dispute of Luther with the Devil*, and that they did not so much as think of any such thing, till more *than sixty Years* after that was published. So then, according to his Reckoning, 'tis a *Cheat* of more than *fourscore Years*, since that *Luther* publish'd the first Account of it, in the Year 1533; and they who know the humour of the Controvertists, are not at all surpriz'd at the bustle they have made upon that Subject; but they rather wonder, that it had not been long before reproach'd to Protestants, that the Devil was the Author of their Doctrine, since none but he instructed *Luther* to contest the Holy and Divine Sacrifice of the Mass. Besides, 'tis easy to guess at those moral Reflections which follow the Train of these vile Imputations, *viz.* That God, whose Providence is ever watchful for the good of his Church, has permitted this wretched Arch-Heretick to discover himself, that so the Catholicks may be the more confirmed in the Faith, and have new occasion offer'd to wonder at the blindness, and the fatal obstinacy that do's attend all Hereticks and Schismatiks: The Author supposeth, that the Advantage which they will have Providence to have managed for Catholicism, by the manifestation of this Dispute of *Luther*, is not bounded there: he imagines that they pretend thereby to render all Protestants unworthy of humane Pity or Compassion, and to expose them to the rigor of the Laws made against those who voluntarily, and by premeditated design, subject themselves to the desires of the Devil: He further insinuates to us, that the Abbot of *Cordemoy* affects

affects to render the Calvinists Accomplices of the Lutherans upon no other account, than to [render them more odious]. And if he engages to answer him, 'tis chiefly to the end, that the Protestants of *Germany* may understand, that Popery is always ill-intentioned against them; and that they have reason to fear every thing, if they once fall into the same condition with the Provinces which have been dismembred from the Empire. I cannot believe that this Abbot had a design to perswade the Higher Powers, that since the Calvinists adopt an Opinion, which *Luther* had learned of the Devil, and that they offer'd their Communion to the Lutherans, they ought to be punish'd as Agents of the Devil; but 'tis true, if we consider those studied Reflections and Invectives with which many Disputants have fraught their Disputes about this Conference of *Luther*, one would be easily induc'd to think, that their chief aim has been to let the World know that the Protestants are the Disciples of a Demon, who spoke face to face with one of their Masters, without disguising his Quality; so that they are very near rank'd in the same Class with those Men who study the Black Art, and are as punishable as Magitians and Sorcerers; and as heretofore many of our Legislators (to gain to themselves greater Reputation) have fain'd I know not what Commerce with the Gods; So *Luther* came in like manner to say boldly, that he had learn'd of the Devil, that which he vented against the Mass. In which the Lutherans now fully justify themselves, and do not at all complain, as he who said,

——— Pudet hæc opprobria nobis
Et dici potuisse, & non potuisse refelli.

To make the Accusation strike home, it must be confessed,

1. That *Luther* being fully perswaded that private Masses were good, he was set upon concerning this Point by the Devil; and that after having made what defence he could, he was at last forc'd to submit to the Reasons of this Spirit of Darkness.

2. That having been convinc'd by these Reasons, he published his Book against the Mass; and in all places where he had

had Interest, made it to be laid aside —— this is what his Accusers suppose, and without that, we cannot see how he was able to oppose the Mass under the Conduct, and by the Instructions of the Devil. Now Mr. *Sagittarius*, after many other great Divines of his Party, *lets us clearly see*, that the thing was not transacted after this manner. —— Therefore, *&c.* ——

'Tis a matter of Fact agreed on by all Men, that *Luther* had published nothing of this Conference before that Treatise which he caus'd to be printed in the Year 1533. And 'tis also certain that he remarks not the time when he was attack'd by the Devil: unless then the contrary is proved, the *Lutherans* may suppose, that this Dispute happen'd in the same Year 1533. and this is what *Balduinus* highly supposes in a Treatise, which he has published upon this Subject against the Jesuit *Serrarius* in the Year 1605. if this Supposition passes, the Accusation falls to the ground, since that 'tis publickly known, that from the Year 1520. *Luther* had written Books against the *Mass*, and that in the Year 1530. it was both highly condemned and forbidden by the Confession of *Augsbourgh*. But taking the thing at the worst, it cannot be supposed, that this Dispute happen'd before the end of *April* 1522. and here is a demonstrative Proof of it. 'Tis certain that *Luther* was made Priest on the Sunday *Cantate*, the Year 1507. and that he confesses, that when he was attacked by the Devil, he had said Mass 15 entire Years, therefore it must necessarily be, that this Dispute happen'd after the Sunday *Cantate* in the Year 1522. Now this Sunday falls out either about the end of *April*, or in the Month of *May*. If it be therefore found, that before the Month of *May*, 1522. *Luther* oppos'd the Mass with all the vigour imaginable, it will evidently follow, that his Dispute with the Devil did not determine him to that. Now these are the Arguments which Mr. *Sagittarius* offers upon this Subject.

1. He observes that *Luther* publish'd his Book *de Captivitate Babylonicâ*, in the Year 1520. and *that de abrogandâ missâ* the Year after.

2. That being called to the Diet of Worms in *April* 1521. where they objected to him (among other Articles taken out

of

of his *Captivitas Babylonica* by the Nuncio *Jerom Alexander*) this, which condemns the Sacrifice of the Mass, and that having acknowledged this Article as his own, he maintain'd it by those Arguments which he had brought in the Book it self.

3. That there is a Sermon, which *Luther* preach'd in High Dutch, in the Year 1520. and is printed in all the Editions of his Works, which contains a long Confutation of the Mass.

4. That 'tis most certainly known, that *Luther*'s Book against *Ambrosius Catharinus* was written by him in *March* 1521.——Now this is a Book where he speaks violently against the Abuses of the Mass.

Mr. *Sagittarius* adds to this these three Considerations.

1. That the *Augustines* of *Wittemberg* began the first of all to abolish private Masses, without imparting it to *Luther* in the Year 1521. which their Provincial Chapter confirm'd sometime after in respect of Votive Masses. *Luther* being yet in the Castle of *Wittemberg*: these are Matters of Fact, of which we have strong Proofs, and the Consequences whereof are not less strong against the Pretensions of those, who controvert this matter. For will they suppose also, that these *Augustins* had learn'd of the Devil what they thought false in the Mass.

2. The Author says in the second place, that *Luther* being come out of Custody, and preaching at *Wittemberg* the 28th of *March*, 1521. declared that tho the Mass was an impious and abominable thing, yet that he did condemn *Carolostad*, who excited Tumults to abolish it.

3. That *Luther* protested in the Book which he writ in the Month of *July* 1522. against the King of *England*, that he holds his Doctrine from Heaven, and that he defended it against the Temptations of the Devil. Now in this Treatise he discourses chiefly of the Eucharist; if it be demanded to what purpose does the second Consideration serve to the design of Mr. *Sagittarius*? I answer, that he makes use of it to show, that the Devil had himself destroyed his own Kingdom, if he had excited *Luther* to the Abolition of the Mass, and if *Luther* at the same time did oppose those Advances, which *Carolostad* had made: Now Mr. *Cordemoy* pretends, that

that the Evil Spirit would not ruin his own Work himself. The result of what has been hitherto read, is, That *Luther*'s Accusers have a little too much confounded the Account of Times; but they have yet much worse setled the state of the Controversy between this Doctor and the Devil; they have supposed it as a thing out of doubt, that what was disputed between these two Champions, was, to know, Whether private Masses were good; and that *Luther* did maintain the Affirmative, but yielded to the weight of his Adversary's Objections. It was nothing less than this, if we believe Mr. *Sagittarius*; *Luther* did not deny to the Devil, that the Sacrifice of the Mass was a very ill thing; it was a Principle to which both Adversaries consented; but *Luther* would not admit of the Consequence which the Devil drew from thence, to wit, that a Man who had said Mass for 15 Years together, ought to consider himself as lost without Remedy. The Devil therefore had a design to raise a thousand Remorses, and a despairing confusion in the Soul of his Adversary: He on the other side sought for Excuses and Justifications, not for the Mass, but for the Fault he had done in celebrating of it; and in fine, all the Consolation that was left him, after that he had seen all that he could say for his Excuse, defeated by the Devil, was, that the Mercy of God, and the Death of Christ Jesus, would preserve him from the Damnation which he deserv'd.——You see here two wonderful Differences betwixt the pretentions of the Lutherans, and those of their Adversaries; these pretend that the Dispute run only upon this Thesis, That private Masses are good, and that the Devil who took upon him the Office of an Opponent, confounded *Luther*. The others say, That the state of the Question was, Whether a Man who had said Mass for 15 Years, was a Sinner pardonable, and that *Luther* who was the Defendant, had been quite gravell'd, if it had not been that he alleadg'd the Merit of Jesus Christ, and the Mercy of God. Can any one consider such diversities of Opinion upon the same Matter of Fact, without adopting the Judgment of Mr. *Simon* (*a*) concerning these Controvertists, *Mutatis mutandis*? The Author complains, That Mr. *Cordemoy* has omitted the last part of the Conference, where appears the design which the Devil had, and the Victory that *Luther* got over them.

(*a*) Nov. de Novemb. 1685 p. 1263.

That which is very strange, is, That many eminent Protestants, *Hospinian*, *Paræus*, and one Modern that is yet of greater Note than those, have confess'd, that the result of this Dispute, was the abrogating of private Masses, so that they agree with the Controvertists of the Roman Party, That *Luther* overcome by the Reasons which the Devil laid before him, reform'd this part of Worship. Now this by no means appears in the account of the Conference, and is invincibly refuted by the Chronology which is above-mentioned. Who can we trust?

There is one other Remark that possibly may not be useless; Mr. (*b*) *Nicole* had objected to the Protestants this Dispute of *Luther*, and has drawn a Consequence from it more odious than the Controvertists ever did. Mr. (*c*) *Claud* answer'd it, and among other things hath observ'd, that these Accusations of the Evil Spirit, were inward Impressions in the Heart of *Luther*. A Lutheran Minister also put forth an Answer to it; against which, a while after, they published a Book at *Paris*, and have added there a particular Reply (*d*) to Mr. *Claud* about this Conference; he complains that he had changed the Word *of Dispute* into that of Accusation. Others are offended with these words, *en son cœur*, *i.e.* in his Heart, which are not in the Latin; Mr. *Sagittarius* supplies wherewith to silence these Complaints; for besides what we have touch'd upon, he tells us, *P.* 5. that *Justus Jonas*, who translated this piece of *Luther* into Latin, has suppress'd many things in the Original, and in particular these words, *in corde meo*, multas enim Noctes mihi acerbas & molestas fecit; which ought immediately to follow this — *Satan mecum cepit ejusmodi disputationem.* This *Justus Jonas* was not Preceptor to *Luther*'s Son, but his Colleague in Divinity, from the Year 1522. *Hospinian* mistakes in this, and confounds him with another who was indeed his Preceptor, and who assisted with *Justus Jonas* at *Luther*'s Death.

(*b*) Prej. Chap. 2.

(*c*) Def. de la repp. 2. P. ch. 5.

(*d*) Elle a été ajoutée à la 2. Edit. dep. Pres. en 1683.

Mr. *Sagittarius* contents himself in this Particular, to say that Mr. *Cordemoy* has follow'd the Error of *Hospinian*, but it must be allow'd that throughout every place else he confutes him with a force that is a little too severe. § One of the places that deserves the greatest Consideration, is this, which shews the design that *Luther* had, when he compos'd that Treatise,

Treatise, wherein we find an account of this Conference. By this means he overthrows all those confused Stories and Illusions which the Missionaries frame upon what *Luther* seems to answer sometimes, as being a good Catholick, tho his Expressions should seem to prove a great deal in this respect, and tho one should not acquiesce with the most probable sense which Mr. *Sagittarius* gives them, yet we must at least agree, that they are not Proofs which equal those of the Chronology already mentioned, and consequently that there was a great deal of Rashness in the matter of Fact related by the Controvertists. The Author qualifies their Dispute far otherwise; for, he thinks nothing can be more villanous than to accuse so many Princes and Cities of *Germany*, of having annull'd the Mass, and reform'd Religion upon a Platform taken from the Devil, not by disguised Suggestions, but by Instructions formally acknowledged to be Diabolical; he maintains, that this is a great Injury, the Infamy whereof, reflects upon his Imperial Majesty, and all those Catholick Princes, who own the Protestants to be Members of the holy Roman Empire, and who have promis'd by solemn Treaties of Peace, wherein the King of *France* interven'd, to give them Toleration of their Religion, and even to maintain it against all those, who should give them any disturbance.—— He adds, that there would have been an apparent Nullity in all this, if the Protestants were such as Mr. *de Cordemoy* has represented them, since 'tis certain, that every Man who professes himself to be brought up by the Devil, ought to be incapable of enjoying the Priviledges of humane Society, and deserves the Punishment of Sorcerers and Magicians. He desires to know, if those, who are now employ'd to make Converts in *France*, do not fancy to themselves something like this, and he wonders, that they do not imitate *Francis of Sales*, who, as 'tis said first began to instruct the *Hugenots* by Exorcisms.

But let us end this Article by that Remark, which we made, speaking of a Writing of the Abbot of *Cordemoy*, in the Novels of *August* 1685. We said that the Devil prefers Truth before a Lie, when he thinks it most proper to excite the Passions, and to be the cause of much Mischief. This is a

Principle which methinks cannot be contested in this particular Dispute, but to the end to perswade the World that the *Lutherans* have follow'd the Devil's Instructions as such, rather than as a Truth. But let them say what they will, this Principle is agreed upon, and we have given a notable Example of it, in the second Edition of this place of our Novels, 'tis of the founder of the Jesuits, of whom they published, that the Devil would have diverted him from his Studies, in giving to him a most lively knowledg of the Mysteries of Religion: That which follows will serve as a Supplement to this.

Father *Bouhours* admirably well describes this Diabolical Stratagem in that place, where he shews us St. *Ignatius* learning his Grammar at the 33*d* Year of his Age.——He says that the Enemy of Men's Salvation, who foresaw to what end St. *Ignatius* his Learning would tend, made use of a cunning Artifice to overthrow his Studies, and so carri'd this new Scholar without any intermission to the Exercises of Piety, fill'd him full of Consolations, and suggested to him such tender Sentiments for God, that all the time that he should have devoted to his Study, was spent in devout breathings; instead of conjugating the Verb *Amo*, he exerted the Acts of Love ——— *I love you my God*, said he, *and you love me: to love to be beloved*, and *nothing* more. When he was in School, his Mind was in Heaven, and whilst his Master was explaining to him the Rules of Grammar, he heard an inward Master that cleared to him all the difficulties of Scripture and Mysteries of Faith.

The Life of St. *Anthony*, attributed to St. *Athanasius*, gives an account of many Temptations of this kind, wherein the Devil made use of the appearances of Truth and Piety.—— 'Tis then a matter confess'd on both sides, that the Devil sometimes maintains a good cause, therefore 'tis no Argument of the goodness of private Masses, to say, that he has strongly opposed them.

His

His other *Objections* about *Luther* are as inconsiderable as these I have answer'd, and they have been spoken to by others; and instead of being press'd with the force, I am wearied with the weakness, and the repetition of them. For Mr. *Pulton* has done like the frugal Man, who saved firing by carrying the same *Billets* out of one place into another. Mr. *P.* has brought his Wooden Objections out of *Bellarmine*'s and *Brerelie*'s *Cellar*, into his Chamber; and he may please, if he needs to be warmer than he naturally is, to carry them back again.

CHAP. IV.

Mr. P's *Objection against the Rule of* Faith shown to be weak, *and unconvincing.*

I Purpose (if God permit) as soon as the approaching Solemnities of Christ's Nativity are (for this Year) past, to publish a distinct Treatise about the *Rule of Faith*. Something I have attempted in the *Tract* entituled, *A Discourse of a Guide in matters of Faith*, but that seems a little too Scholastical for ordinary Readers. I intend a shorter and plainer Book for more common use. In that I shall deliver the Reason of the Case, without further regard to Mr. *Pulton*, or any other Disputer, than as the Rule shows it self, and that which is crooked.

At present I shall offer that which may refute Mr. *Pulton*'s Reasonings, which, howsoever they sounded, when they were heard from his Pulpit, are

now,

now, that they come to be seen and felt, no such formidable things.

1. If I had wholly *refus'd to return an Answer to his Question about the Bible*, I had not departed from Reason. When two *Jews* dispute, they do not contend about the Truth of the Writings of *Moses*. When two *Mahometans* dispute, neither of them do call in question the *Alcoran*. And when two Christians Dispute, he that questions the Bible does unnecessarily contend about that which he allows.

2. If I had persisted in the *Suggestion* concerning such Discourses, as *tending to Atheism*, or rather Unbelief; No Man who is tender of the moments of Religion would have blam'd me, considering some of the Company that was about us. By such Questions such Converts are made, as Father *Simon* has made by his *Critical History* of the Old Testament. S. *Paul*'s Rule is little observed by the *Controvertists* of this World: "Him that is weak in the Faith re-"ceive, but not to doubtful Disputations.

3. If I had answer'd his *Questions with Questions*, the way had been justifiable before all equal Judges. I mean (among others) such Questions as these, about the Copy to which the Romanists are tied in all Disputes, by the *Council of Trent*. Why do you make a Translation your Rule, and not the Original? Why do you not follow the ancient *Italic* Translation us'd in the Latin Church? Why is St. *Hierom* for one Translation, and your Popes for another? What Latin Translation was the Church tied to in St. *Austin*'s time, when there were numberless Translations? and why did the Church suffer them if one was their Rule? Why did the Popes *Sixtus Quintus* and *Clement the 8th*, differ from one another

in

in many places, beſides thoſe which might be Errors of the Preſs? Why did not St. *Gregory* the Great go by this Rule? Why did Cardinal *Ximenes*, *Pagnin*, and *Mariana*, correct it? Why did Cardinal *Cajetan* help himſelf in the Tranſlation by a Jew? Why do's the very Learned French Biſhop *Huetius* here and there touch it over again? Why do's Father *Simon* (a) himſelf, who differs ſo much from it, tell us, that it ſerves as a Rule? And if it be, what Rule is it to the People who underſtand no Latin? And what Tranſlation of it have they by their Church into the Vulgar Tongue? Laſt of all, (to refreſh his Memory about Pope *Innocent* the Third); Why did not HE go by the Rule of the Vulgar, if in his Time it was a Rule? He varies from it often, and particularly in the Text of the *Penetential Pſalms*, where he thus pleaſantly begins his *Elucidation*.

(a) Sim. Hiſt. Crit. p. 313.

Inno. 3. op. fol. 105.

"This Pſalm, according to the Tranſlation which "the Roman Church holds, contains *nine Verſes*, "by which the Penitent gradually aſcends to the nine "Orders of Angels, becauſe there is greater joy among "the Angels of God over one Sinner that repenteth, "than over 99 juſt Perſons, who need not Repen- "tance, although the number of ten Verſes, which "according to another Tranſlation it is known to "have, agrees well to reaſon; becauſe Man who fell "by Sin, riſes by Repentance, that by him the "*Tenth Order* may be reſtored. Deſervedly alſo this "*Pſalm* has *Three Ternaries*, becauſe Repentance "ought to have Three Parts, *Confeſſion* by the Mouth, "*Contrition* in the Heart, and *Satisfaction* by the "Work.

Now here's your *Pope* for obſerving a *Rule*, and giving an infallible Interpretation.

4. The

4. The Universal Testimony which I mentioned as separate from Authority, and proving the Books of Scripture to be such Writings as they are taken to be, depends upon a *firm Principle* which Mr. *Pulton* has not shaken; to wit, that so many Persons of such different Places, and Conditions, and Interests, and Perswasions; could not possibly be Confederates in a false Testimony in this Matter; no not so easily as in the Testimonies given for the *Offices of Cicero*, the History of *Livy*, and the Existence of the Cities of *Jerusalem*, or *Rome*. The sense of this was *thrice* repeated in the *Conference*; and now the Answer is, a Denial that ever it was said. Father *Nicole* would have yielded what Father *Pulton* would not; for thus he speaks (a) both his own and *Monsieur Jurieu's sense*. "When the "consent of the Universal Church is ge-"neral in its several Ages, as well as in "its several Communions, this unanimous "consent makes a Demonstration. But perhaps *Monsieur Nicole* is not *Father Pulton's Pope*.

(a) De l'unitie de l'Eglise, p. 183. Quand le consentement de l'Eglise Universelle est general dans tous les siecles aussi bien que dans toutes les Communions, ce consentement unanime fait une demonstration.

5. But why has he chang'd his Rule of a General Council for a living Judg? And for what Reason do's he call the Bible MY RULE of Faith? It is the Rule of all the Reformed; It was the Rule of the Ancient Church. It was St. *Austin's* Rule, and he thus owned it to be so: *In those things which are plainly contained in the Scriptures, all those things are found which contain Faith and Manners of living.* (b) For the *Creed*, or sum of things to be believed, S. *Ireneus* called it the *Rule of Truth*; and *Tertullian*, the *Rule of Faith*. The *Scripture* is the Rule which God hath

(b) S. Aug. de Doctr. Christ. l. 2. c. 9. p. 45. In iis enim, quæ apertè in Scripturis posita sunt, inveniuntur illa omnia quæ continent Fidem moresq; vivendi.

hath given his Church: Whom then makes He himself when he goes about to *confute* it (*r*)? and whom does he make me, when to ME he ascribes the *Rule*? 'Tis wonderful surprizing that Mr. *P.*, tho he *venerates Creatures*, should make ME, whom he reviles, the *Object* of his Worship. But so at the same time they worship'd *Mercury*, and threw Stones at him.

(*r*) *Mr. P's Rem. in the Title Page. A Confutation of the* DOCTOR'S RULE OF FAITH. *And* p. 14. *The* DOCTOR'S RULE *of* FAITH *prov'd insufficient.*

6. Against this Rule he has taken exception, and it will soon appear whether they are, or are not, causeless.

I will first examine his more *General Reasonings* and *Authorities*, and then descend to his more *special* Points, about the *Sabbath*, *Easter*, *Infant-Baptism*, and the *Holy Trinity*.

His more *General Reasonings* are Six.

OBJECT. 1. "Hereticks have from Christ's "time appeal'd to the *written Word of God*, which "therefore cannot be the Rule of one true Church "that is essentially different from an Heretical one. *Mr. P's Rem.* p. 15.

ANSWER 1. This is not true in History: for *Irenæus* and *Tertullian* mention Hereticks who refus'd the Scriptures, and were (as the latter calls them) *Fleers from the Light*.

2. This Argument proves nothing because it proves too much: for it is an Argument against

all Rules. Hereticks have appeal'd to REASON, therefore *Reason* is no Rule. Hereticks have appeal'd to the dictate of the *Spirit* of God, therefore that is not a *true Spirit*. *Hereticks* have pleaded *Tradition*, therefore *Tradition* is not to be pleaded. Heathens have pleaded *universal Consent*, [*All* Asia *and all the World worship'd* Diana] therefore universal Consent is not to be regarded. Contentious Men in Civil Kingdoms plead *Customs* and *Presidents*, and *Maxims of Law*, and *Statutes*, therefore none of these are *Rules* in *Government*. Many have appeal'd to *Popes* in Uncanonical Causes, therefore the *Pope* is no Judg. The later *Arians* pleaded the *Councils* of *Sirmium* and *Rimini*, therefore *Councils* are not to be pleaded. *Miracles* have been pretended to from the beginning by Impostors as signs of Truth, therefore true Miracles are no Proofs. False Appeals to a true Judg or Rule do not argue against the Truth of Judges and Rules, but against the confident and restless Contentiousness of the Appellants.

Further, if *Hereticks* from the beginning appeal'd to the Scriptures as their Rule, so did single *FATHERS* and *Councils* of them too: Therefore Mr. *P.* concludes equally against the *written Word of God*, as an insufficient Rule, from *Fathers* and *Councils*, as from *Hereticks*. And thus with great discretion, he has shut out the Witnesses whom he accepts of, that he may exclude those, to whom he is unwilling to give admission. In sum, the Church may be *one*, the Society may be *one*, and the Rule *one*, and very sufficient, tho ill Men will either pretend

to

to it, or reject it. Many false Christs have risen up, yet one only is true, and he did many real Signs, and those who saw them would not yet believe in him.

All this Objection is a transferring the fault from the Men and fixing it upon the faultless Rule.

Object. 2. "Ay! but when Heretieks appeal to "the Scripture, a living Judg will condemn them, "and secure the Government of the Church, as a "living Judg do's the Quiet of the State. *Mr. P's Rem.* p. 16.

Answer. All Churches rightly constituted have living *Judges*, and such as are as *infallible*, as the Judg or Judges in the Roman Church. That is, having a true and plain Rule in Necessaries, it *is* their own wilful failure, if they pronounce in necessary Doctrine, or Rule of Life, a false Sentence. But still Mr. *P*'s difficulty remains; for *Heretieks* will no more regard the Judg than the Rule, and they will no otherwise have a regard in their Judgment to the living Judg, than as they believe he goes by the dead Rule. And that which keeps the Peace in Churches and States is such Authority, to which their *Fears* submit, when their *Reason* or Interest do not. Therefore where *Infallibility* is pretended, where Men are at the feet of the seven Hills, whence the Fountain of it is said to spring, it is by thousands no further regarded, than as it has Power to enforce it. And the Keys of the Inquisition keep such more quiet in that Inclosure, than those of St. *Peter*. For the rest, *some know better*, and fear by their Separation in necessary things, to open a gate to Atheism

and utter Disorder, and so groan secretly under a Burden which they openly profess to have no weight: And *others*, born in that Communion, being set by their Teachers against Examination as private Presumption and damnable doubting, and a way to endless Uncertainty, remain with the multitude in that way, of which they have not yet asked the Question whether it be the old and the good one, or not.

Mr. P's Rem. p. 16, 17.

Object. 3. If a Man uses all *Ministerial Helps*, and cannot be satisfied in himself, that he either has sufficient helps, or that he has us'd them, and be left after this, to *his own Conscience*, may not this Man's Conscience be erroneous, and actually err in things necessary to Salvation? If so, then his Religion may be Fancy, and not Divine Faith.

Answer. Here again our *Jesuit* has taken up a two-edged Weapon. For his living Judg is but still a ministerial help [not (saith St. *Paul*) that *we are masters of your Faith, but helpers of your Joy*]. For such a Man, before he accepts him for a Judg, must be convinc'd that he ought to accept him. And what if he be a Man of *Pisa* or *Basil*, and will bring him to the Canons of the ancient Church? And what if he be a Man of weak Capacity, and cannot understand the Arguments for such a Judg? What if he be a learned Man, and understands the Arguments better than the Imposer? and what if he has a scrupulous Mind which cannot be satisfied, not for want of outward Means, but through inward Distraction and Anxiety? Why then such *a one must be left to his Conscience*, whatsoever it be, in the Roman Communion

nion as well as the Reform'd. If that Church can instruct him, so can ours. If it has cause to excommunicate him, we have that Spiritual Power also, but would not exercise it where there is demonstration that Men are sincere in their Perswasion and have taken due Pains, and are, in their dissentings, modest and peaceable.

If they are violent by blind Zeal, or by Faction cover'd under the venerable Name of Conscience, then, when the Common-Wealth is Christian, the Civil Powers in their way, preserve the Peace of the Church.

In *fine*, when we speak of very scrupulous and unperswadable Men, what effect can *Infallibility* have upon them? For if they cannot be convinc'd that they have taken sufficient pains, and that the Ministry, under which they are, is sufficient; how will they be convinc'd merely by hearing it said to them, they must not dispute, they must submit to an Infallible living Judg? For that is the great Thing which so many Thousands scruple even among themselves. That was an Expedient among the *Pythagoreans*, who were to be in Quietude and Silence, and submit in all things to, THE MASTER SAID IT. Yet they divided into many Sects, as is evident in the History of the *Italic Philosophy*. To say, there is a certain Guide, and on him you must depend wholly for your way, is to spend Breath and Confidence in vain, till the Wanderer knows who this Guide is, and whether he may absolutely depend upon him. If he still questions him, he must take his own way; and if he takes *him*, 'tis still in effect his

his own way, for he takes him upon this last Act of his own Judgment, that he is an Infallible Guide.

But what if his Conſcience prove Erroneous, and his Faith be Fancy?

I Anſwer, *Firſt*, as above, he has as good ſecurity in this Church, as in any other, for he has as ſufficient means, and better than in ſome.

Secondly, A Man of good Capacity uſing theſe Means in Chriſtian manner, if nothing diſtracts his Judgment, and diſables his Capacity, ſhall not be brought to ſuch Scruples as ſhall end in Fancy inſtead of Faith.

Thirdly, If he has natural *Incapacity*, God will not judg him for a Talent he had not. Such a Man even under the Goſpel, may be as much without the *Law*, as the Heathens were without the Law of the Jews. For an Ideot, or a Man under a diſtraction, is without that as a Rule, which he is not capable of uſing or apprehending.

Fourthly, If a Man has *Capacity*, without Probity of Mind, and pretends Scruples, he ought not to abuſe the *Good Word*, Conſcience. He ſhould ſay it is his Luſt, or his Appetite, or his Fear, or his Profit, or his Vanity. And to ſuch a one, all Church-Governours, who give beſt Revenues and moſt Eaſe to Fleſh and Blood, are ſufficiently infallible. They give him ſecurity of Pleaſure and Profit, and that is as much Aſſurance as he aſks.

Fifthly,

Fifthly, If a Man has had a good Capacity, and an honest Mind, but is shatter'd into variety of doubtful Thoughts, by bodily Distemper, by suddain worldly Losses, by Terrors from the Anathema's of the Bold and Uncharitable, by being call'd to by several at the same time, with great and restless Importunity, saying, This is the Way, the right Hand is the Way, the left Hand is the Way; I say, if such a Man, by such Disturbance, by repeated dinns of Clamour, and by such other Mechanick Influences, has the Frame of his Head so open'd, as to let in a Scruple which cannot be remov'd, or an Error which cannot be resisted; let not Man judg such a one, his Case must be reserv'd to God.

This is the safety of Men, and the true Bottom on which they may be easy in all Times of Controversy, and in all Places and Circumstances, *viz.* That they, doing their present best, with a good Heart, both for Judgment and Manners, and repenting sincerely of the Omission or Abuse of former Means, God will accept of them according to what they have, and not according to what they have not. And this anticipates Mr. *Pulton*'s

Object. 4. "That Men of his Communion using "all possible means for Truth, are not therefore to be "punished with *Draconic* or *Sanguinary* Laws; be- "cause, when all is done, they are to be left to their "Conscience. For this is yielded to Men of all Communions, upon supposition that the Government is satisfy'd, 'tis not Humour, Interest, or Faction, but fi- M. P. Rem. p. 17, 18.

nal

nal Conſcience, and not preſent Perſwaſion, which needs only conſideration for the altering of it, and may be put upon conſideration by Diſcipline. Provided alſo, that Publick Peace be ſecured: which Peace if Men diſturb out of final or preſent Conſcience, (as *Saul* did that of the Aſſemblies of Chriſtians) a careful Governour uſes Civil Power againſt them for Example to looſer Men, and to them by way of Reſtraint rather than Puniſhment. And in ſuch Caſes their Confinement is a *Bethlem*.

Mr. P's Rem. p. 18.

Object. 5. "The Primitive Chriſtians made a *True Church*. To a True Church, the Rule of a Church "is Eſſential. This Church ſubſiſted many Years "without a compiled Canon, for ſeveral Years paſt "without any written Goſpels or Epiſtles, either di"vulg'd or compil'd into a Canon: Wherefore the "written Word of God can't be the only true Rule "of Faith.

Anſwer. *Part* of this Objection is *falſe Hiſtory*, and *part* of it is *fallacious Reaſoning*.

Part of this Argument is *falſe Hiſtory*.

For, *Firſt*, The firſt Chriſtians were not without the Old Teſtament, which is the ſame Rule with the New, though the New is clearer: And that Rule was illuminated by the very coming of Chriſt.

Secondly, St. *Matthew*'s *Goſpel* was written and divulged, and accepted within very few Years after Chriſt's Aſcenſion, and ſo was St. *Paul*'s *firſt Epiſtle*

to

to the *Theſſalonians*; and the whole of the New Teſtament was written during part of the Life of a Man; for St. *John*, a Diſciple of Chriſt, was the laſt Writer.

Part of this Argument is *fallacious Reaſoning*.

For, *firſt*, The New Teſtament was a Rule to the Chriſtians before it was *compiled* into a Canon: for by *compil'd*, he means compil'd into a Codex, or Volume of Canons by a Council: for Canons, Laws, and Statutes, are Rules before they are collected into a Body; and we ſee the Sacred Scripture cited as the Rule, by St. *Ignatius*, *Clement*, *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, and other Ancient Chriſtians before any Council met to compile them. And the Jews had the Law for their Rule, before *Eſdras* (as they ſay) put the Holy Writers together.

2. *Writing* or not *writing* does not alter the Chriſtian Rule which is the ſame ſpoken or written. But a Rule, which may be preſerved without writing for a few Years, and whilſt the Apoſtles were alive and to be conſulted, and Evangeliſts commiſſion'd by them, (who wrought amongſt them real Miracles, whilſt they taught the Chriſtian Doctrine, and expounded the Old Teſtament, and after the manner of Chriſt opened the Underſtanding of the People, that they might underſtand the myſtical Senſe of the Old Covenant) was not likely to be preſerved ſo entirely and ſo uſefully, without writing, to the end of the

World: Nor was the Law truſted without writing. When therefore, we ſay that the *Scriptures* are our Rule, what elſe do we mean, but that the *Doctrine* of the *Meſſiah* firſt taught by him, and afterwards written down by Evangeliſts and Apoſtles for the ſake of Poſterity, (to whom nothing could have been accurately tranſmitted for ſo long a time from Mouth to Mouth) that this Doctrine *firſt preached*, and *then written*, is the Rule of his Diſciples. It is a Fallacy then to ſay, that a Rule once not written and afterwards written, is not the ſame, becauſe one is not written and the other is. And it is ſo weak a one, that no Man of Judgment will be infnar'd by it. For he knows in his own little Affairs that *an Account* made firſt by word of Mouth, and afterward written down for the avoiding of Miſtakes, and for the Preſervation of that which frail Memory would loſe, is but the *ſame Account*. So our Rule which was *firſt dictated* and *then written*, is but one Rule. When our Saviour ſaid it, and St. *Paul* repeated it, and St. *Luke* wrote it down, that *it was more bleſſed to give than to receive*, the Rule was not altered but preſerved: And our Saviour ſaid many other things which, becauſe they were not written down, are not known.

Object. 6. "Neither the univerſal Church, nor "any part of it, deliver'd the Proteſtants the Bible, "as they have it—The other Books being brought "under examination in the Year 397. were found to "be of equal Authority with thoſe which were for-

"merly

"merly received. So that the Protestants not recei-
"ving the Books they call Apochryphal, want ten
"parts of the Rule. For the making good of this
Reasoning, he mentions the Authorities of the
Councils of *Carthage*, *Constantinople*, and *Florence*,
and of the Fathers, S. *Austin*, Pope *Innocent* the first,
Pope *Gelasius*, and Pope *Eugenius*. *Mr. P's Rem.* P. 18, 19.

Answer. His *Reasoning* shall be first consider'd, and
then his *Authorities*.

1. His *Reasoning* is not right upon *two Accounts*.

First, The Rule of the Scripture is not like a
Mechanick Rule, of which just so much serves for
measuring. For the Scripture is both a *sufficient* and
an *abundant* Rule. And, strictly speaking, our Rule
of Faith is rather *in the Scripture*, than the entire
Volume. For the necessary Doctrines are few, and
they are often repeated: and the same things are
said more than once, by *Moses*, by the Prophets, E-
vangelists, and *Apostles*: There is good use to be made
of all the Books extant, but if some of them had
been wanting, the Rule of Faith might still have
been contained in the rest.

If therefore we lay aside some Books he calls Ca-
nonical, it does not thence follow that the Rule of
Faith is shortned, because the *Code* of the Canon
is less. All things in Scripture are useful, but all

things are not Doctrines absolutely necessary to Salvation.

Secondly, Whilst he argues for a Rule larger than the Primitive Church received, and adheres to a later Canon, he argues against Tradition. For he takes up that which is later, and prefers it before that which was earlier in the Church. Whereas Tradition descends, but does not ascend. Now Learned Men of his own Communion allow that the ancient Church did not receive his Additional Canon any more than the Reformed will allow his Additional Creed. When both are reduc'd to the ancient Standard, the Church of God will enjoy a greater measure both of Truth and Peace. I will lay before the *Jesuit* the Judgment of a *Sorboniſt*, who has read as many Eccleſiaſtical Books, and made *as great Collections as he pretends to* (*a*), and to better purpoſe, than has yet been manifeſted by him. I mean Mr. *Ellies du Pin* (*b*), "Who ſays of *Tobit*, *Judith*, "*Wiſdom*, *Eccleſiaſticus*, the ſecond Book "of *Maccabees*, the Hiſtory of *Suſanna*, "and *Bell*, that they are Books left out "of the Canon by the Jews, and by "many ancient Chriſtians, and ſome "that, received by the Church. He ſays this, but in other places, he, for Church-Reaſons, is not ſo conſtant to himſelf.

(*a*) *Mr. P's Full Account*, p. 9.---*had read all Eccleſ. Hiſt. and had Volumes of Notes*, &c.

(*b*) *Du Pin* Nov. Bibl. des Auteurs Eccleſiaſtiques, tom. prem. *p.* 653.

Livres Mis hors du Canon par les Juifs, & par pluſieurs Anciens Chretiens, & receus depuis dans L'Egliſe. Tobie, *&c.*

I might therefore have rather mention'd the great *Cardinal Ximenes* whoſe *Polyglot Bible* was dedi-

dedicated to Pope *Leo* the *Tenth* (the Pope, in whose time *Luther* liv'd) and, in expreſs words (*c*) by that Pope approv'd. That Cardinal in *his Preface* does thus inſtruct his Readers, "That the *Pen-*
" *tateuch* is ſet forth in a threefold
" Tongue, Hebrew, Chaldee, Greek, (with La-
" tin Interpretations of each). That the *Hagio-*
" *grapha* and Prophetical Books are in a two-
" fold Tongue, Hebrew and Greek, with Latin
" Verſions. But (as he goes on) the
" Books out of the Canon which (*d*)
" the Church receives rather for the
" Edification of the People, than for
" confirming the Authority of Eccleſi-
" aſtical Doctrines, are only in Greek,
" but with a twofold Latin Tranſla-
" tion, the one St. *Hierom*'s, the other the Inter-
" linary (reading) word for word.

(*c*) Conſenſu Leonis motu proprio & ex certâ Scientiâ comprobantis, &c.

(*d*) At verò libri extra Canonem, quam Eccleſia potius ad ædificationem Populi, quam ad Authoritatem Eccleſiaſticorum Dogmatum confirmandum recipit, &c.

This may ſatisfy Mr. *P.* (if he be a reaſonable Man) that he was not infallible when he denied there was any Canon like ours at *Luther*'s appearing.

Mr. *P.* will perhaps ſay (for ſomething ſome Men will ſay when they cannot ſay that which amounts to an Anſwer) that he has produc'd *greater Authorities*; and that *du Pin and the Cardinal are not his Popes.*

I come therefore,

2*dly*, To the Examination of his *Authorities*, after having ſuggeſted this general Anſwer to them, or any others which he ſhall be able to bring forth out of his Magazine of *voluminous Collections*. That is to ſay, that the *Apochryphal Books* being valuable, ſome Churches received them as a *Secondary Canon* (ſo his own *Sixtus Senenſis* called them) and yet not as a *Canon of Faith*, but *Manners*. And the Fancies of Men after ſome Apocryphal Books were read in Churches, being apt to affect the introducing of more; it was thought Prudence to limit that *Secondary Canon*, leſt Books ſhould be multiplied to the hinderance of the Scripture, and the prejudice of Truth. Our Church inſtructs the People in the Reaſon of the Reception of the Apocryphal Books, and the diſtinction of them from the Primary Canon out of S. *Hierom*.

Article 6.

" Holy Scripture containeth all things neceſſ-
" ry to Salvation: So that whatſoever is not
" read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not
" to be required of any Man, that it ſhould be
" believed as an Article of the Faith, or be thought
" requiſite or neceſſary to Salvation. In the name
" of the holy Scripture we do underderſtand thoſe
" Canonical Books of the Old and New Teſtament,

" of

" of whose Authority was never any doubt in the " Church. Of *the Names and Numbers of the Ca-* " *nonical Books. Genesis, Exodus*, &c. And the other " Books (as *Hierom* saith) the Church doth read " for Example of Life and Institution of Manners, " but yet doth not apply them to establish any " Doctrine: Such are these following, the three " Books of *Esdras*, &c.

Mr. P's great and leading Authority is the third Council of *Carthage* (*a*) in which (if you give credit to a Man that witnesses for himself, that he *has read all Ecclesiastical History*) the Books we call Apocryphal, were found to be of *equal* Authority with the rest, and consequently received into the Canon.

(*a*) *Sit Canon* 47. *Mr. P's Rem.* p. 18, 19.

Here I intreat the Reader to make with me these Observations.

First, Mr. P. notes on his Margin (*b*) concerning the Council of *Laodicea*, that it was *only a National Council of no general Obligation*; but he points not at his Council of *Carthage* (which was later, and but a *Provincial Council*) with any such marginal Finger.

(*b*) *Mr. P's Rem.* p. 18.

Secondly, Whereas he says (*c*) that the Council of *Carthage* was confirm'd in the sixth Council of *Constantinople* in the Year 680. he forbears to add, that

(*c*) Pag. 19.

that there was no Enumeration of Books in that Council, and that the National Council of *Laodicea* was there *confirmed* as well as the Provincial Council of *Carthage*. And he observes not that the Council of *Laodicea* was confirm'd by the great Council of *Chalcedon*, not so the Council of *Carthage*. This sure was done to show his Impartiality.

Thirdly, He observes not that the Council of *Laodicea* was taken into the *Code* of the Universal Church, but not the Council of *Carthage*. The first *Collection* of that *Code* ends with the second General Council, the first of *Constantinople*. It is true that *Council* ended about 16 Years before the Synod of *Carthage*, but the Collection was not made so soon, tho before the Year 431. Nor is the Council of *Carthage* added to that Code in the Collection made afterwards. It is true, it is in the *African Addition* in *Dionysius Exiguus*, but in the more ancient one it is not to be found.

Fourthly, He omits the Note (*a*) in the Collection of his dear Friends *Labbe* and *Cossart*, put under this 37*th* Canon of *Carthage* about the Scriptures, "[A certain Ancient Code has it thus. "Touching the confirming that Canon "Let the Transmarine Churches be consulted." There was no full Satisfaction among them in these Additional Books; and for satisfaction they did not refer meerly to the Roman Church.

(*a*) Concil. Tom. secund. Conc. Carth. p. 3. p. 1177. Quidam vetustus Codex sic habet. De confirmando isto Canone Transmarina Ecclesia consulatur.

Fifthly,

5ly, This Canon could not be a Canon of the *third Council of* Carthage, held (as Mr. *P.* ſays) in the year 397. for Relation is had in it to *Boniface*, who began his *Pontificate* about the year 419.

6ly, It is not true, that this Council found theſe Books to be of *equal Authority* with the reſt.

1. Learned and impartial *Romans* do not ſay what Mr. *P.* does; and the Preſumption of the Fathers of *Trent*, in ſetting them upon the *ſame Level*, is very heinous, as well as very new. *Cardinal Cajetan* was much of another mind, but neither is he Mr. *Pulton*'s Pope.

2. The former Books of the Old Teſtament (for about that Canon is the Conteſt) were own'd by Chriſt himſelf and St. *Paul*; But theſe were not, could not be ſo: And the Canon of the *Iſraelites* (in *Joſephus*) is ours.

3. The Council of *Carthage* call'd theſe Books Canonical upon no other account than as Books allow'd to be read in Churches. This is clear'd by (*a*) the latter part of that ſuppoſed Canon; for there the Fathers would have it known to *Boniface* and other Biſhops, in order to the confirming of this Canon, that they had received theſe Books to be read in the Church; and then they give leave alſo, that the *Paſſions* of *Martyrs* may be there read too upon their *Anniverſaries*.

(*a*) A Patribus iſta accepimus in Eccleſia legenda.

2ly. It is true that St. *Auſtin* (his next beſt Authority) was a Conſenter in general to the *Council* of *Carthage*; and by that which he teaches about the *Additional Books*, we ſhall underſtand them not to have been eſteemed of *equal Authority* with the former Ca-

non; so that Mr. *P.* by producing St. *Austin*, has brought us a Key to the Council of *Carthage* for the shutting out of himself.

Let us hear St. *Austin* in *the very place* cited by Mr. *P.* and afterwards in other places, in which his mind is not ambiguously delivered.

The place cited by Mr. *P.* is in St. *Austin*'s Book *De Doctrina Christiana*, in which Book that Father asserts a Mystical sense in the Sixth Chapter of St. *John*, (and in the very next (*a*) Chapter to that cited by Mr. *P.*) the *Sufficiency*, and *Perspicuity of the Scriptures*. If his Authority be valid for the Canon, Why is it not for these latter Points? But how very wide is Mr. *P.* of St. *Austin*'s sense in this very place about the Canonical Books? St. *Austin* affirms they are not all of *equal Authority*, and Mr. *P.* affirms they are. St. *Austin* before the Enumeration of them, lays down these Rules of Caution: A man must hold this measure in the Canonical Books; he is to prefer 'those 'Scriptures which are received of all Catholick 'Churches [where note, he speaks of more Catholick Churches than one; that is, by Catholick he means Apostolick and Orthodox] 'before those which some 'do not receive, and in those which are not received 'of *all*, let him prefer those which the greater number, 'and the more considerable Churches receive, before 'those which the Churches which are fewer and of 'lesser Authority receive. 'But if he shall find some to 'be received by the greater number of Churches, and 'others by the more considerable, (tho' this will scarce 'be found) yet my opinion is, that such are to be 'esteem'd of equal Authority.

(*a*) S. *Aug.* de Doct. Christiana, c 9.

There are many other places in S. *Austin*, which make his mind very plain to those who are not so blind that they will not see.

Two

Two places may at preſent ſuffice.

The firſt is,

In his Book of the City of God (*a*). There he ſpeaks of other Books which are not Canonical, and amongſt them reckons thoſe of the *Macchabees* which were not in the Canon of the *Iſraelites*, received as canonical by the Church by reaſon of the Suffering of *certain Martyrs*; by which paſſage it appears, that the Church read them not as a primary Canon of Faith, but a ſecondary Canon of Manners.

(*a*) *Auguſt.* de Civitate Dei. l. 18. Cap. 36. Tom. 6. p. 1096. Ab hoc tempore apud Judæos reſtituto Templo, non Reges ſed Principes fuerunt uſq; ad Ariſtobulum; quorum ſupputatio temporum, non in ſcripturis ſanctis, quæ Canonicæ appellantur: ſed in aliis invenitur, in quibus ſane & Macchabæorum Libri; Quos non Judæi ſed Eccleſia pro Canonicis habet, propter quorundam Martyrum paſſiones vehementes, atque Mirabiles: Qui antequam Chriſtus veniſſet in Carnem, uſque ad mortem pro Dei lege certaverunt, & mala graviſſima, atque horribilia pertulerunt.

The next place is in his ſecond Book againſt the Epiſtle of *Gaudentius* (*b*) in which he aſſerteth that the Writings of the *Macchabees* were not received by the *Jews* as they received the Law, the Prophets, the Pſalms, for which our Lord bears Teſtimony as his Witneſſes; but that it is received by the Church, and not *unprofitably* if it be ſoberly read or heard, eſpecially by reaſon of the *Macchabean* Martyrs. As to the *reſt of his Authorities*, they are a further Teſtimony of the choice he made in his *great Collection*.

(*b*) S. *Aug.* l. 2. contr. Ep. Gaud. c. 23. p. 313. ——hanc quidem ſcripturam, quæ appellatur *Macchabæorum*, non habent Judæi ſicut legem, Prophetas & Pſalmos, quibus Dominus Teſtimonium perhibet, tanquam Teſtibus ſuis—— Sed recepta eſt ab Eccleſia, non inutiliter ſi ſobrie legatur vel audiatur, maxime propter illos *Macchabæos*, qui pro Dei lege ſicut vera Martyres, &c.

For his *Epiſtle* of *Innocent*, it was ſhuffled at laſt into the *Roman Code*, which was very long without it.

Nor was the *Decree* of *Gelaſius* known to the World,

till some Hundreds of years after his death; and then it came forth out of the Dark Ware-house of *Isidore Mercator*. Nor does it speak of the *Order of the Canonical Books*, but of *the Books of the Old Testament*; and it makes mention but of one Book of the *Maccabees*.

Further, to what purpose is it, after so great a gap in time as is betwixt these Authorities, to mention the *Council* of *Florence*, not held till the Year 1438. in which there was *no Decree* at all about the *Apocryphal Books*, tho' he asserts the contrary, from the *no Authority* of those who deceived the modern Epitomizer *Caranza*. What Pope *Eugenius* might do, is in this Cause insignificant. As to that whole Council, the *Greeks* at their return, and when they were at Liberty, undid that which, out of fear and hope of Succour, they seem'd to agree to whilst they were in the Territories of the Papacy.

2. Touching his *particular Points*, seeing he only mentions them, and asks Questions about them, without further Discourse upon them; I will return him here a very brief answer, reserving the further consideration of them, for the forementioned Tract.

First, For the *Lords-day*; seeing a time is to be set apart for the Worship of God, and that the *Israelites* by God's appointment, kept one Day in Seven Sacred; and that tho' the Law *written in Tables of Stone*, so far as it was Typical and Mosaic, *was done away*; and that Christ came to perfect, and not destroy the Law; and that Christ rose on that day; and that *on that day at Pentecost his Church properly began*; and that this day was generally observed by Christians, not meerly by *Romans*; there is so strong a Scriptural Reason for the obser-

obſervation of it, that no Church-Authority can omit or alter it without doing that which is irrational and unbecoming a Chriſtian Society: And if the *Roman* ſhould make this Attempt, it ought not to be obey'd.

2. Concerning the *Feaſt of Eaſter*, and the time of its obſervation, I do not know who they are among Chriſtians, who make it *one of the Neceſſaries to Salvation*. There is reaſon for making a ſolemn Memorial of Chriſt's Reſurrection; but that the Apoſtles ſetled the time, is contrary to the expreſs words in the Epiſtle (not of *Philippus*, as the Editor miſtakes, but *Theophilus*) in the Council of *Cæſarea*. (*a*) Which Epiſtle, tho it is not ſo very ancient, yet it is ſet out as ſuch by the Jeſuit *Bucherius*.

(*a*) Poſt Reſurrectionem vel Aſcenſionem Domini Salvatoris, Quia diſperſi Apoſtoli quomodo Paſcha deberent obſervare, nihil ordinare potuerunt: per univerſum mundum ad prædicandum fuerunt occupati.

3. *Concerning Baptiſm* (Mr. *P*'s third Point) he ſays 'tis neceſſary to Salvation.

If he had ſaid *generally neceſſary*, our Catechiſm had thus far agreed with him. And St. *Auſtin* fetches his proofs for Infant-Baptiſm out of the Scripture againſt the *Pelagians*, as our *Church-Office does*. And they who conſider, that Infants are capable of ent'ring into Covenant with God, and that Chriſt hath mentioned no other Gate of admittance into his Church, but Baptiſm, will fear the omiſſion of Baptizing Infants. And he who has regard to the Analogy of both Covenants, will as readily conſtrue our Saviour, as requiring the Baptizing of Infants in that command, Go and bring into the Chriſtian School *All Nations*, as a *Jew* would have conſtrued *Moſes*, as requiring the Circumciſing of Infants, if he had ſaid, Go and Circumciſe all Nations.

4. For

4. For the Doctrine of the *Blessed Trinity*, the *Arians* opposed it by Tradition, and the Fathers prov'd it by Scripture. And the place in St. *John*'s Epistle, *There are three that bear Record in Heaven*, was by the *Arians* believed to be of such force against them, that they removed it out of many Copies.

(a) St. Hil. de Trin. lib. 5. Propheta loquitur, Evangelium testatur, Apostolus interpretatur, Ecclesia confitetur verum Deum esse, qui visus sit, cum tamen Deum Patrem visum nemo fateatur.

Instances are infinite: I will produce but one out of St. *Hilary* (a) which shews the way of the Fathers in proving the Divinity of Christ out of the Scriptures. St. *Hilary* compares the places in *Isa.* 6. St. *Joh.* 12. and *Rom.* 10. and then draws this Conclusion: 'The Prophet speaks, the Gospel witnesseth, the Apostle interpreteth, the Church confesseth him, who was seen to be the true God, whilst no man owneth that God the Father was seen.

CHAP. V.

Mr. P. *consider'd with Relation to what he hath said about the* Lateran *Council.*

MR. *Poulton* had mistaken *some hundreds of Years* in time, about the great *Lateran* Council *; and he was tax'd for it in particular manner before Mr. *M.* and neither of them then deni'd it; and now ‖ he turns it off by an Evasion (which *Katharine* heard) *that he appealed to a General Council, and troubled not himself with a private Man* †, meaning the Monk *Paschasius Radbertus*. If this had been his Answer, what occasion could there have been for this Question, put aloud to Mr. *Merideth*, *Why do you bring a Man* [for Mr.

* See D. T's Account, p. 15, 81.

‖ *M. P's* Full Account, p. 9.

† Rem. p. 26, 27.

Mr. *M.* is a manager in Conference] *who has not common skill in Hiſtory?* But notwithſtanding, He *certifies* for himſelf, that he has profound skill, for *he had read* all *the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory* [eſpecially the Acts of *Innocent* the third] *and had* Volumes *of* Notes *relating thereunto: Volumes* better worth 10000 *l.* than the Books which I am wont to boaſt of, before *Catharine in the Cloudes*, and other ſuch Witneſſes. ‡ M. P's Full Account, p. 9.

For this *Lateran Council*, let us weigh a little (for a little weighing will ſuffice for a Feather) theſe *Reaſonings and Authorities* about the *Lateran Council.*

He proves it to be a General *Council*, becauſe *Binius*, *Labbe* and *Carranza*, give ſuch an Account of it; and becauſe I oppoſe it by *Father Walſh* the *Franciſcan*, who (it ſeems, weak man) is nothing in the hands of three ſuch Defenders of the Auguſt Aſſembly *. That it may appear the more Auguſt, he Notes that it was held againſt the *Hereſies of the Albigenſes.* * M. P's Rem. p. 27.

Now he ſhould either have left out the Perſecution of the *Albigenſes* on his ſide; or his Epithets of *Sanguinary*, *Bloody*, *Penal*, on ours; for as long as the *Saint* of the *Lateran* Council (St. *Dominic*) is remembred, Blood and Penalties will not be forgotten.

This by the by, and he will chide me for *Rambling*, I return to Father (*a*) *Walſh* and *Binius*. And (*a*) M. P's Account, p. 11.

1. I did not prove this Council by the mere Authority of Father *Walſh*, but only noted how Father *Pulton*, and Father *Walſh* agreed about their Rule of Faith in the great Article of *Tranſubſtantiation*; and how Mr. *P.* had own'd a Depoſing Canon, and denied it's Depoſing Doctrine; but this was with nimble art to be ſo clearly ſkipt over, as not to be touched (*b*). (*b*) D. T's Account, p. 81.

2. I

2. I do (in one point at least) value Father *Walsh*, above his very famous *Binius* and *Labbe*, for they were friends of the *Deposing Doctrine*, and he has been an open Enemy to it, and for that Reason drawn no small hatred upon him.

Binius has * words to this effect in his Collection of *Councils*; *Bonifacius* VIII —— Justly *Excommunicated* Philip *the* IV. *of* France, *firnamed the Fair, for his Violation of the Law of Nations*: *Labbe* repeats them in the *August Edition* of the *Louvre* without any *Note* in the Margent against them; but this giving Offence, in the next *Edition* a Note is added, which is rather an Evasion than a Reproof of that Doctrine (*a*).

* Bonif. VIII. Vita & Epist. ap. Lab. Tom. II. part 2. p. 1398.

(*a*) Ib. A. 1294. Errat *Binius*; tantum abest, ut *Philippus* juste excommunicatus fuerit, ut ne fuerit quidem Excommunicatus

He Notes that *Binius* err'd, he does not say in the *Doctrine* of *Excommunicating the King*, but in the *History*; because *Philip* was not (in one Jesuits Opinion, tho he was in another's) Excommunicated at all. Moreover in the second *Apparatus*, of *Labbe*, and *Cossart*, Jesuits, to their Collection of Councils, * they have publish'd without Reflection this dangerous Doctrine, That the *Pope alone has power to depose an Emperor, Kings, and any other kinds of Power.*

* Jacobat de Concil. l. 7. de Cap. Concil. p. 329. 2 col. unde Gl. 1. in.

After this, is it possible for any man to guess, why this *Franciscan* is not this *Jesuits* † *Pope*?

† D. T's Account, p. 15. Mr. P. answered. *Father Walsh* was not his *Pope*.

You will be wide of the Mark, if you say it is because Father *Walsh* is an open *Remonstrant*, and against deposing. Whether the Acts of this Council were genuine or not, I now dispute not. But 'tis certain, 'twas no truly *General Council*, and yet that the *major Part* of *Romish* Writers have said it was. And seeing Mr. *P.* is become one of that number, let him, with more Art than others have done, attempt the evading the genuine Sense of its *Decree* (*d*) for the Extirpation of Heresie, owned afterwards by the Bull of *Martin* the V.

(*d*) Conc. Lat. 4. cap. 3.

V. It was then thus *decreed*, "That if a *temporal Lord* "being requir'd and warn'd by the Church, ſhould "neglect to purge his Dominions of Hereſie, he ſhould "firſt be excommunicated by the *Metropolitan*, and "the other Biſhops of his *Province*; whereof, if with- "in a years time, he gave no ſatisfaction, the Pope "was to be warned, who might abſolve his Subjects "from their Allegiance, and expoſe his Dominions to "be ſeiz'd on by Catholicks; who having deſtroyed "the Hereticks, might thenceforward poſſeſs it with- "out any contradiction, and preſerve it in the purity "of the Faith, *ſaving the Right of the Principal Lord*, on "CONDITION that he put no hindrance. And it is expreſly added, that the ſame Courſe is to be obſerv'd *towards them, who have no Principal Lords.*

CHAP. VI.

Mr. P. *conſidered in relation to what he has ſaid, touching the antiquity of Popery in* England.

THREE things on this ſubject Mr. *Pulton* aſſerts; yet there is not one of them which he can maintain.

1. He aſſerts (*a*) *that Popery flouriſhed in this King-dom*, near a *Thouſand years* (he might as well have added my number of Ten thouſand) before *Proteſtancy was ever heard of*; and that we our ſelves confeſs it. Whereas we ſay, that the *Britiſh* Biſhops proteſted

(*a*) M. P's Rem. p. 2.

againſt the Popes Juriſdiction above a Thouſand years ago; that we had *Witneſſes* againſt *Romiſh* Errors before *Luther* roſe: That our Faith is the Faith in the Ancient Creeds; and that if our Proteſtations againſt *Romiſh* Errors are new, it is becauſe *they* were new, and that we could not ſweep out the Dirt, till they had brought it in; and that we are the ſame Church as from the beginning, the Corruptions only being remov'd.

(b) M. P's Rem. p. 26.

2. He *avers* (*b*) that the Corruptions I mention are but *ſuppoſed*, and that I ſhall never be able to ſhew that St. *Gregories Faith was not that which* Rome *now teaches.*

(c) D. T's Account. p. 77.

I had ſaid already that *Gregory* the Great (*c*) had "not ſent into the Land the ſame Canon the *Romaniſts* "now go by; for he would not allow the Books of "*Macchabees* to be Canonical. Now according to Mr. *Pulton*'s Art of Logic, if *old Popery* has a ſhorter, and *new Popery* has a longer Rule, the Popery is not the ſame; But *then was then, and now is now.*

(a) M. P's Rem. p. 26.

3. He aſſerts concerning the Doctrines of the Two famous Synods, the *Second of Nice*, and that of *Trent*, (*a*) that they are not here oppugn'd, unleſs by Hereticks *deſirous to retain the name of Catholicks.*

The name *Catholick* is ſometimes with them *a mark of the Church*, and now Hereticks covet and uſe it: 'Tis a mark and no mark. Now for the Synod of *Nice*, he commits a miſtake, for I cited *Hoveden*, for the oppoſition of it to the Worſhip *of Images*, and not, as he forgets, to the *Corporal preſence.* And becauſe he is juſt now in good humour, and promiſes a *fair* and *candid Anſwer* (*b*) when my proofs out of *Beda* and *Hoveden* are produced, I will produce a place or two. He will do well for varieties ſake, to ſay ſomething that is *fair* and *candid.*

(b) M. P's Rem. p. 26.

For

For *Hoveden* in relation to the Decree of *Nice* about Image-Worſhip, his Teſtimony is this (*c*): "In the "year 795. *Charles* King of the *Franks* ſent that Sy- "nodical Book to *Britain*, which had been directed to "him from *Conſtantinople*, in which Book (alas and "wail the day) many inconvenient things, and *CON- "TRARY TO THE TRUE FAITH*, were "found; but the greateſt grief was, that it was con- "firmed by almoſt all the Oriental Doctors, no leſs "than Three hundred, if not more, Biſhops with una- "nimous ſuffrage, *THAT IMAGES OUGHT "TO BE WORSHIPPED, WHICH THE "CHURCH OF GOD UTTERLY AC- "CURSETH.* Againſt which [Decree] *Albinus* wrote "a Letter wonderfully ſtrengthened by the Authority "of the Divine Scriptures, and brought it, together "with the ſaid [Synodical] Book to the King of the "*Francs* in the name of our Biſhops and Princes.

(*c*) Rog. de Hoveden Annal. pars prior. p. 405. —— Anno 792. *Carolus* Rex Francorum miſit ſynodalem librum ad Britanniam, ſibi a Conſtantinopoli directum, in quo libro (heu proh dolor) multa inconvenientia, & veræ fidei contraria reperiebantur; maxime, quod pene omnium Orientalium Doctorum non minus quam trecentorum vel eo amplius Epiſcoporum unanimi aſſertione confirmatum fuerit, Imagines adorari debere, quod omnino Eccleſia Dei execratur; contra quod ſcripſit *Albinus* Epiſtolam ex authoritate divinarum Scripturarum mirabiliter affirmatam; illamq; cum eorum Libro ex perſona Epiſcoporum ac Principum noſtrorum Regi Francorum attulit.

As to *Beda*, in relation to the *Corporal* preſence, one place may ſuffice, tho' in him there are many. Now in his Commentary on St. *Luke* he teaches, that

(*a*) "Inſtead of the Fleſh and Blood of the Paſchal "Lamb, he did ſubſtitute the Sacrament of his own Fleſh "and Blood in the FIGURE of Bread and Wine. And the words following ſhow that he meant it of ſuch Bread and Wine as *Melchiſedeck* gave to *Abraham*, who certainly was not preſented with mere *ſhows and Accidents*.

(*a*) Beda in Lucæ Evang. cap. 22. lib. 6. p. 424. Col. 2. —— Ut viz. pro carne Agni, vel ſanguine ſuæ Carnis ſanguiniſq; Sacramentum in panis ac vini figura ſubſtitueret, ipſum ſeſe eſſe monſtraret, *cui juravit Dominus, & non pœnitebit eum tues ſacerdos in æternum, ſecundum ordinem Melchiſedec*; frangit autem, &c.

(*b*) D. T's Account, p. 78.

From *Knyghton* I had asserted, (*b*) That even in the latter time of *Wickliff*, there was no *such Doctrine then in* England *as Transubstantiation publickly imposed as an Article of Faith.* I cited not then the Recantation of *Wickliff*, nor the Book in which that Author is; and Mr. *P.* not finding it (as I conjecture) in his *Volumes of Collections*, he passed it over in silence.

I will oblige him with it at length, tho it is hard Language for a man that has been Eighteen Years out of *England.*

(*a*) H de Knyghton de Event. Anglice l. 5 p. 2647, 2648.

I knowlecbe (a) that the Sacrament of the autar is verry Goddus Body in fourme of Bzede: but it is in another manner Goddus Body then it is in bebene. Foz in beben it is sene sote in fourme and figure of Flesbe and Blode. But in the Sacrament Goddus Body is be mpracle of God in fourme of Bzede, and is be neuther of sene sote: Ne in mannes figure, but as a Man leebes foz to thenk the kynde of an Ymage whether it be of Oke o of Ashe, and settys his thooust in biu of whome is the Ymage: so mycbe more schuld a Man lede to thenk on the kynd of Bzede, But thenk upon Christ, foz his Body is the same Bzede that is the Sacrament of Autere, and with alle clennes, alle devocion, and alle charite that God would gif him, worschippe be Crist, and then he receybes God gostly more medefully than the Prist that syngus the Masse in lesse Charite. Foz the Bodely etyng ne profytes nouth to Soule, but in als mykel as the Soule is fedde with Charite. This sentence is prophyde be Crist that may nouzt lye. Foz as the Golpel says, Crist that Night that he was betraied of Judas Scarioth, he toke Bzede in

bise

bise handes, and bleſſide it, brak it, and gaf it to bise Diſciplus to ete. For he ſays, and may not lye, This is my Body.

CHAP. VII.

Mr. P. Considered in his Accusations.

ACCUSAT. I.

HE cannot ſtep over two Pages, before he is gotten into his *Innuendo's*, and his, '*This reflects upon* '*the King* (*a*). He accuſeth me for want of Reſpect, in 'charging the Religion of which the ſworn Head of 'his own Church is a Principal Member, (which as 'themſelves [the Proteſtants] confeſs) flouriſhed in 'this Kingdom near a Thouſand Years before *Prote-* '*ſtancy* was ever heard of) to be ſuch, *whence a moping,* '*lying, and uneaſie temper,* naturally flows. All this I 'believe he might write himſelf; it is original.

(*a*) Mr. P's Rem. p. 2.

For *want of reſpect,* (or rather the humbleſt duty, where it is ſo juſt a tribute), I ſhall never fail to pay it. And here in this inſtance, the fault with which he taxeth me, he himſelf committeth. He *wears* the Sacred name of a King, by uſing it upon every unneceſſary occaſion. Whereas they who underſtand the profound civil veneration which Crowned Heads may challenge, are at the ſame time frugal in the mentioning of their Names, and free and abounding in their Allegiance. Add to this, that they leſs honour a Prince than they ought, who create any uneaſineſs to his Subjects, and that

that is an uneasiness which is not pleasing, when in common conversation men are under Terror; when they have a suspicion, that their words shall be watcht, and each innocent phrase, which the Hearer likes not, shall be called a Reflection upon the King.

But (to come to the strength of his Accusation) what a false and invidious consequence is here? *J. S.* grew worse upon Mr. *Pulton's* tampering with him, and so it appear'd to D. *H.* and Mr. *V.* and divers others; therefore the *Roman Religion* is such whence a *Mopish, lying and uneasie temper* NATURALLY flows. I suppose this consequence was not drawn by him by the *Art of Thinking*, which the ingenious *Jansenists* have publisht. Must that be *Natural* to a Religion which may be the effect of dissettlement, and the fault of the method of the *Tamperer*? There are many made worse by Empyrical practicers, though the Physick it self might not *Naturally* do it. Mr. *P.* talkt so much of *Luther* and the DEVIL, and of DAMNATION *out of his Church*, that *J. S.* might for some time, be under an affrightment. If I may say it in his own light way, he ought to have forborn his stories of *Goblins*, when he was putting his Child to rest in his Mothers bosom.

From his Premises then, the Conclusion is not my want of duty, if he draws it, not with Jesuitical, but Logical Art. I wish him a greater share of Loyal duty himself.

He will (he says) REFER himself to the JUDGMENT OF HIS MAJESTY, (*a*) which seems a familiarity bordering on irreverence. His Half-sheet Friend has written a FULL ANSWER to the SIX CONFERENCES concerning the *Eucharist*. [a *Full* ANSWER in the same sense that Mr. *Pulton's* Book is a FULL

(*a*) Mr. P's *Rem.* p. 31.

FULL ACCOUNT.] And he likes me not the worse (I hope) because he finds in me a little of the *Æquivocator*. For I openly call my self the PUBLISHER, but (in his opinion) I am secretly the AUTHOR. Now he THREATENS me *with a smarting* Discipline * when the Church of *Rome* shall be Triumphant. He leaves this *sting* in the close of his Paper, [*God be thanked our Church is too strong to waver by the blasts which flow from his mouth, and will* TRIUMPH, *when perchance the Doctor may* SMART *for having attempted its destruction.*] Here's want of respect with a witness to his Gracious *Majesty's principle*, That *Conscience cannot be forc'd*. Mr. *P.* himself is *again* besides his bounden Duty, when he opens those wounds in his *next Accusation*, which the Royal Clemency would heal.

* A Full Answer to D. *T's* Six Conferences concerning the Eucharist.

Mr. P. *consider'd in his Accusations.*

ACCUSAT. 2.

HERE Mr. *Pulton* (for my utter Affrightment) has † conjur'd up the Ghosts of the Duke of *Monmouth*, and Sir *Thomas Armstrong*, whom I assisted in their Extreams. And he has charg'd me with *assisting* the latter of these, *without obliging him to an humble Confession of his Crimes, and acknowledgment of the Injury done to his King and Country*. For tho Sir *Thomas Armstrong* and D. *T.* (who had never before been in his Company) were then in *private* within thick Walls, and several Locks, yet *Katherine in the Cloudes* was invisible there, and gave Information to Mr. *Pulton*. And, *note well* here, his *Argument* which cuts me on both sides. If I do not reveal *Confessions*, then it

† M. P's Rem. p. 32.

it cuts me for not *Revealing*, and injuring Government; and if I do *reveal Confessions*, then it cuts me for opening such a Seal, as is not fit to be broken up. For his Brother *Bellarmin* the Jesuit * has *demonstrated* it, in the case of his other Brother *Garnett*, *That he could not have reveal'd the* Gun-powder Treason, *made known to him in* [what he calls] *Sacramental Confession, without having made a discovery of the Traitors. Therefore he chose rather to lose his Life by a cruel Punishment* [not crueller than that Treason] *than violate the very holy Secret.*

* Bell. Apol. c. 17. p. 328, 329. Jam. autem supra demonstratum est non potuisse Garnettum detegere proditionem in Confessione Sacramentali cognitam, nisi etiam detegeret Proditores: Ideo maluisse crudeli supplicio vitam amittere, quam Sacrosanctum secretum violare.

M. P's Rem. p. 34, 35, 36.

*A. P.** further *informs* the World [*A. P.* has used a very fit word, for it is (as I observed before) *right informing*] that he has lately reconcil'd Two zealous *Protestants*, one of which had been with the Doctor, and sincerely desired to be satisfied in certain *Queries* about an uninterrupted Succession of the *Protestant* Religion from the Apostles, About the Fallibility of the Church of *England*, And about the Miracles of the *Roman* Church.

To *the first* he says, I answered only, 'twould cost Ten Thousand pounds worth of Books to show it: A Thousand I might say; but I said something besides, and might have said much more, having *just then* preached upon that very subject of *visible Succession*, upon those words, *A City built upon a Hill cannot be hid*: What I said was *open*, and before Hundreds of Witnesses: what he reports, was private, and attested by one with whom I had no reason to use much freedom of Speech. But does Mr. *P.* consider the Cost of Books, out of which a man may prove minutely since Christ's time

time, *Succession of Doctrine* in the Christian Churches? It is true he may do it in some manner with little Cost, but not *amply* and to the satisfaction of Cavillers without much Money and Labour. For Examples sake; There are MSS. relating to the Eastern Churches, which a man would willingly use in this Argument: And the purchase of that one Book of *Dionysius Syrus*, in which 'tis manifest that new Popery was not old Christianity in the great Article of their Corporal Presence, did not come from so far a Countrey to *Arch-bishop Usher*, at a very easy Rate.

If Mr. *P.* would condescend to learn from *Protestants*, and look into the Learned Work of Dr. *Pearson* late Bishop of *Chester*, and Mr. *Dodwell*, who have set that right in the *Chronology* of Popes, which no *Romon* Writer could effect before them; he would be convinc'd, *how many pounds worth of Books* were necessarily to be consulted, in order to the clearing of that one matter in the *Succession of a very few Popes*. I will take leave to say further, that a small Sum will not purchase all the Books necessary for the answering of this Question, "Whether a Woman did not set in the Papal Chair, "betwixt the Pontificates of *Leo* the IV. and *Benedict* III. And there are some who would not spare Cost for the retrieving of that History which was cut out of a fair MS. of *Ranulph* of *Chester* (*a*).

(*a*) See *Al. Cook* Dial. & le sieur de Congnard. p. 85.

To the *second*, how the Church of *England* granting her self to be fallible (and for ought she knew, in actual Error) could be the Church built upon a Rock, *&c.* he assures me, I answer'd nothing; but instead of answering, grew warm, and call'd the party Impertinent and Impudent.

Now, thus much is true, There came a Woman to me with *Queries*, as many have done; and some of

them have been sent upon no very commendable designs. She was a Person I never (to my knowledg) saw before or since, much less in a Church, or at a Sacrament. She own'd (to the best of my remembrance) that *her Brother was a Priest*; She had the very *Shibboleth* of the Party. Perhaps she was not formally reconcil'd, for I perceive a great many are some years contracted, e're the Priest joins their hands; but they live all the while very lovingly together. I told her of my Suspicion, that some *Priest* or other, had sent her of an Errand, and at that saying, she seem'd out of Countenance: So little Reason had I for the incivility of saying She was *Impudent*. But however, if *Katherine Lamb* was there in her Magical *Mantle*, she may (I doubt not) prove it upon me. I do not affect the finesses of Courtship; but for IMPUDENCE it is a word I do seldom use to those who deserve it. But if I gave her a Reproof for coming with her *Snares*, I did not trespass against good Manners by doing Justice. It is much that I had nothing to say upon this Argument, when Mr. *Meredith* may remember that upon the Objection as made by him, I gave him this answer, to which he has not yet repli'd, That our Church was no more Fallible than any other in the World; That God's Providence would not suffer all to fail together; That we had a certain Rule and Sufficient means; That we were as infallibly sure of the Necessaries of Faith, as a man is of casting up a Sum right; tho', by misattention, 'twas possible to commit a mistake: And that our Church could prove it had rightly computed. This was said to him at the side of the Bed in the second Room about the Close of our Talk.

For the *Third*, about *Roman* Miracles, he thus misrepresents

present me, in his very pleasant and Comical Humour: 'You talk, said he, *of Miracles in the* Romish *Church*, 'I'le shew in one *Example*, what *Credit* they are of; 'There was upon a time a certain *Priest*, who got money by 'exposing the head of a pretended Saint to the peoples 'charitable *Veneration*: Now as *Providence* would have 'it, a *Chirurgion*, on what *suspicion* I know not, pierced 'this Saintly Head with his Launce, and found it to be 'a piece of *Parchment*; now, said he, tell me of Roman 'Miracles *again*. This was certainly the happiest 'stroke of a Launce we shall ever find mentioned in 'History; if his Hand was not that of a Lady, his 'Eyes, at least, those of an Eagle, and his Heart of a 'Lyon. I wonder this Chirurgion is not Canonized 'by the pretended Reformers, for thus totally routing 'the *Romish* Church: What need then of tumbling 'over *Concordances*, and beating mens Brains to search 'out misapplied Texts of Scripture, and bring them in 'by the Head and Shoulders against *Popery*; an in-'stance whereof we have in that *Learned Catechism* 'lately cry'd about the Streets; and to give it the 'greater Credit, father'd on our Doctor, when this one 'story of the Chirurgion, with the help of Doctor 'T's Application, would every whit as well do the 'feat, and be as much to the purpose: As you may see 'by this *Specimen*. Master. *Were there ever any Miracles* 'wrought *in the* Roman *Church these Twelve hundred* 'years? Scholar. *No, for there was a Chirurgion*, &c. 'Master. *Must we then believe, that all those recounted* 'by St. *Austin*, St. *Gregory*, St. *Bernard*, *Venerable* Beda, 'and *Infinite others*, *were so many Impostures?* Scholar. 'Yes, *for there was a Chirurgion*, &c. Can any man be 'so unreasonable, as to desire a more irrefragable Proof 'of the *Roman Churches* Errors?

Our Accuser is very *smart* upon me, and I must mind him, when he says *smart* things; (*a*) or else he will take it for a *Neglect* (*b*). He is here as grave as he was in his Pulpit, when he talked of an *Arian Caller capping of Texts with a Protestant Doctor.* Here's smartness again! *Capping of Texts*, and *capping of Shooes*; he is mightily improv'd in the space of a Month for a man that has been Eighteen years out of *England*; for I suppose they never quibble, nor speak, nor write, nor read any *English*, in the *English Seminaries* abroad. But to return to the story, if he by mis-telling it, and making it a *Tale*; and I by telling it, as it is in the Book, do not justify my self, and shew his Talent in Repetition, I am in Tale-telling a most fallible man. The story is neither more nor less than this in the Book, from whence I repeat it (*).

(*a*) Mr. P's Rem. p. 31. The Doctor here omits *A.* P's smart (but just) return, *&c.*

(*b*) Mr. P's 3d. Letter p. 43. your last was in terms so ambiguous, *&c.* You *won't neglect* my Paper, *&c.*

(*) La. Pol. du Cl. Fr. p. 68, 69, 70.

'——These Gentlemen are——so imprudent, 'as to bring to light such scandalous Histories as re-'joice Hereticks. For example, can any thing be more 'terrible than what they have caused to be printed 'against Indulgences and Relicks, with that *Bull* of *In-'nocent* the XI. which condemns some supposed Re-'licks without design of injuring those that are real? 'Amongst others this is one of the Stories they have 'published; in the year 1668, Pope *Alexander* the 'VII. sent into *France* three Chests of Relicks, to be 'put into the Hospital Church; these Three Chests 'were bound up with Red silk Cords, and sealed with 'the Seal of Cardinal *Ginetti*, Commissary for the Re-'licks, and with the Seal of the Popes *Sacristain*. 'These Relicks were accompanied with a Bull, which 'said, they might with all surety be exposed to the Ve-'neration of the people; they had already caused Mag-'nificent Bills to be fixed in every Quarter of the City,

'to

'to draw the people to this Devotion. The Biſhops of 'Bayeux, and *Cahors*, Father *Don Coſme*, Father *Craſſet*, 'and the Abbot *Fromentieres*, were to Preach during 'the *Octave*. It was however order'd, they ſhould be 'ſearch'd. In the third Cheſt was found a Head, which 'at firſt appear'd to be a real one; It had this Inſcrip-'tion, (*b*) *The Head of St. Fortunatus.* In ſearching 'it, there was perceived above the ear a piece of Pain-'ted Cloth. The Phyſician, whoſe name was *M. de S.* 'Germain, took an Iron Inſtrument and ſcraped it, 'and thruſt it in, and found it was a Paiſt-'board Head. They put a lighted Candle into the 'Head, but the light did not appear through; at laſt 'they caſt the Head into hot water, which defaced 'the Paint, and the Paiſt-board fell in pieces. *M. de St.* 'Germain made his *Verbal Proceſs* thereupon. But by 'a *Letter of Cachet*, he was forbidden to ſhow it upon 'pain of being ſent the ſame moment to the *Baſtille*. 'Is not it inſupportable that Hereticks muſt learn 'ſuch like Stories *from Catholicks?*

(*b*) *Caput Sancti Fortunati.*

Now I appeal to men of common ſenſe, whether this was repreſented as it ought to be, either by a Woman of ſo raw a Conſcience as to doubt her Salvation in our Church; or by a *Jeſuit*, who ſpeaks ſo frequently *of the day of Judgment*, and has *cited me to appear at that day for denying the modern Real Preſence* (*a*). Here let the Miſrepreſenter call for his *Chirurgion* for the healing this breach he has made in his *ſincerity*.

(*a*) Mr. P. Rem. p. 30.

But *A. P.* goes on, and with great Condeſcenſion (*b*) 'grants that the Doctor added another Story to 'fix this wavering mind of the Queriſt, in an Aver-'ſion to the *Roman* Church, and it was of a perſon of 'his own Acquaintance who had been at *Rome*, where 'he had known thoſe who for *ſix-pence a Month* obtain-'ed

(*b*) Mr. P's *Rem.* p. 36.

'ed a *dispensation* to live at discretion, and violate the 'Commands of God, and the Church at pleasure.

He is again a very *Fidentinus* in repeating. Instead of this it was said that Pope *Leo* (*a*) in *Luther*'s time set out a Book of Rules, in which the greatest Villanies, even Incest with nearest Relations, was rated at a few pence (*b*), and that I had this Book of Rates of the Edition of *Rome*. I do believe I added, that I had had an acquaintance there, who if the Priest was but sure of his *Six-pence*, was never importun'd by him to see Mass. Now if a *Julio* be Six-pence farthing, then I am quite lost with him for a Computer. For this is his very charitable opinion, I am commenc'd Doctor at *Salamanca*, and become a very *Titus* in Narrative (*c*).

(*a*) Regulæ Ordinationes & Constitutiones cancellariæ. *S.D.N.D. Leonis divinâ providentiâ* Papæ X. Scriptæ & correctæ in Cancellaria Apostolica.

(*b*) Taxæ sacræ penitentiariæ Apostolicæ Ed. Rom. ap. Jac. Mazoch. Anno 1516. die 19. Mart. *Absol.* pro eo qui *Matrem*, sororem, aut aliam consanguineam, vel affinem suam aut commatrem *carnaliter* cognovit. *g.* 5. Absolutio pro eo qui Virginem defloravit. *g.* 6. Absolutio pro vitio *Symoniæ* pro Laico. *g.* 6. Idem pro Presbytero. *g.* 7. Idem pro Monacho. *g.* 8. Absolutio pro *Perjurio* *g.* 6.

(*c*) Mr. *P's Rem.* p. 36. Now had this Story fallen from Dr. *Titus's* mouth, &c.

Now tho mine is the History, and his the Fable, yet upon it he gives me this friendly advice (*d*) that I addict not my self much for the future to this way of *Tale-telling*.

(*d*) Mr. P's *Rem.* p. 37.

For once, however, I will decline his advice, and the rather because he does not use it himself. And I will tell him a Tale out of a Jesuit's School, and it shall be about his beloved Article of *Transubstantiation*.

Bellarmin the fam'd Cardinal and Learned Jesuit, wrote a *Catechism* for Youth. He pretends in it to lay the Grounds of Religion. You will perceive by the Story, that his Grounds and mine do very much differ, if I be the Author (as I never said I was) of the *Catechism* cry'd about in my Name, in the Streets *. He means (if a man can guess at *his* meaning)

* M. P. Full Account, p. 36.

ing) the *Catechism* of the Church of *England*, *with Scripture Proofs*. *Scripture Proofs* are good Grounds, whomsoever they offend, but they will not always serve the Jesuits turn. Therefore he has found out an easier way, and a pleasanter way for Children; for Story-telling shall settle them in the Faith. Thus then we find it in the *Edition* of *Colegn*; tho in the *English Editions*, they are as sparing of putting it in, as they are of the 2*d Commandment*.

‖ '*Scholar*. Explain, I pray you, by some Example, 'How it may be possible for our Lords Body to be in so 'many Hosties, as many as are found upon so very many 'Altars?'

‖ Bell. Chr. Doct. Expos. jussu Clem. 8. Pontif. Comp. Col. Agr. A. 1617. *p.* 174, 175.

Master. —— It is written in the Life of St. *Anthony* 'of *Padua*, That when he was preaching in one of 'the Cities of *Italy*, he was by means of the Divine 'Grace, at the same time in *Portugal*, and there did 'another good Work. Now therefore, if God could 'bring it to pass, that St. *Anthony* should be in his own 'form in two such distinct places at such distance; how 'should it not agree to his Power, to effect it, that 'Christ should be in many *Hosties*, under the shew of 'the same *Hosties*?

This is my Story from *Bellarmin*, who forgat to prove it. Now Mr. *Pulton*, if he pleaseth, may call it *Impertinent*. But here is *Catechism* for *Catechism*, and *Allen* for *Rodriguez*. And here is the Cardinal in his Cloyster setling the Doctriue of *Transubstantiation* with St. *Anthony here*, and St. *Anthony there*, and St. *Anthony* at the same time in his own figure in *both places*. And here is the Parish Priest settling the matter about *Looseness* and *Relicks*, with the *Tax* of Pope *Leo*

Leo, and the *Probe* of St. *Germain*. And if his Doctorship (*a*) ought not to have told the latter, the former might have been let alone by the *Cardinal*.

(*a*) M. P. R. p. 36, 37, &c.

Seeing there are such Tales, and they themselves tell them, why may not I, when I can so pertinently do it, be a *Rehearser* of them? Is not their own *Angelinus Gazæus* a Teller of Tales? And does he not give his Book the Title of *Pia Hilaria*, or *Pious Merriments*? Have not *Capgrave*, *Alford*, *Cressey*, told Tales in abundance? Was not the *Liber Festivalis* (||), read here in Churches in K. *Hen.* VII. time, a book of stories? 'Ex. gr. It speaks of *Adam* and *Eve*, standing for Penance in the Water till they were as Green as Glass. 'And whilst one has written the *Golden Legend*, another has taken the freedom to write the *Wooden one*.

(||) L. Fest. p. 15, 16.

Legenda Lignea.

ACCUS. 4.

D. T. has (like E. S. from whom he 'has borrowed') quoted (*a*) St. *Cyril* most DISINGENUOUSLY, 'leaving out that Text (*b*) which if cited, would have 'left no place of doubting, but that he makes for the 'Roman Catholick Tenet; part of it is as follows: *That* 'which seems Bread, is not Bread, although to the Taste 'it appears to be so, but is the Body of Christ*; He that 'cavils about such a Text, has, doubtless, great humility of soul, and notable dispositions of Faith.

(*a*) Mr. P's Rem. p. 38.

(*b*) ὁ φαινόμενος ἄρτος οὐκ ἄρτος ἐστὶν, εἰ καὶ τῇ αἰσθήσει γεύσεως δίδοτος, ἀλλὰ σῶμα Χριστοῦ.

Note, That not one word was quoted out of St. *Cyril* in the Conference.

Answer:

ANSWER.

Answer: This NOTE has a little of the *Equivocator* in it; *He did not cite in Terms at length, therefore 'twas not produced at the Conference.* EXCELLENTLY WELL! (as his word was to me, as often as I had answered, and he began to reply); the plain truth is this; he named St. *Cyril's Catechism* for the proof of *his Corporal Presence*; I did prevent his repeating the words, by saying that I knew them, and that they needed no Answer from me, being answered already at the end of a certain *Printed Conference*; to which he replied, that there was a *Printed Answer* to that Account of the *Conference* betwixt Mr. *S.* &c. and that he would shew it me; now that *Famous Answer* I could never yet hear of, any more than I could hear of the *Famous Paper* Mr. *Pulton* promised to print last Monday Seven-night for the clearing the Certificate of *Katherine in the Clouds.* See here ch. 1.

Well, but the Answer was *borrow'd* from *E. S.* just as a man borrows, when he promises you a Citation out of St. *Austin*, and truly cites his words. But when I have occasion to borrow, I should as soon borrow of the Reverend *E. S.* as of any man; for he has a mighty Stock of good Learning, and he is very Communicative. I would not so soon go to Mr. *P.* notwithstanding he has read (*a*) *all Ecclesiastical History* (he says it himself, and he is an Oracle) *and has Volumes of Notes relating to it.* But where is my *Disingenuity* in leaving out words, which were not in the place I promised to repeat? And what need was there of adding those words? The sense of them was enough shew'd in the words produc'd; to wit, that the Consecrated Bread

(*a*) See Mr. P's Full Account, noted in D. T's p. 81.

was no more *mere* Bread, than the Consecrated Water is *meer* Water? And for the *disingenuity* of the Reverend *D. S.* if Mr. *P.* can shew us it, it is a new discovery. I suppose that this which follows, will satisfy the just Reader, that the *disingenuity* is in the *Accuser*, and not in him who is unworthily reflected on.

To

To —— *D. T.* &c.

SIR,

HAVING the Curiosity to turn over Mr. *P's Remarks*, I found my self *remark'd* upon in his *Postscript* with wonderful Civility and Kindness; of which I thought fit to give you this Account. He charges me *with most disingenuous leaving out some words of St.* Cyril, *which if cited would have left no place of doubting that he makes for the Catholick Tenet.* Whereas the Design of that part of the *Discourse* was to answer this very Quotation of *S. Cyril*, which was urged by M. *W.* in the Conference; His Words are, 'But to *Theodoret* he would oppose 'S. *Cyril*, who in his Fourth *Myst. Catech.* says expresly 'Tho thou see it to be bread, yet believe it is the Flesh 'and the Blood of the Lord Jesus; doubt it not since he 'hath said, *This is my Body*. Our Business was to answer the Testimony produced by them; and I do not remember the least omission as to the strength and force of it; and those words Mr. *P.* produces, signifie no more than the other, unless he thinks the Sense of *Tasting* more Emphatical than that of *Seeing*: But I suppose his meaning is, that there is omitted that Clause, *That which seems Bread is not Bread, altho to the Taste it appears to be so.* But this is the very same difficulty in Sense, which was answered: For *if tho we see it to be Bread, yet we are to believe it to be the Body of Christ*; P. 38. Conference, p. 36. Ed. 76.

then according to him, the meaning is, *though we see it to be bread, it is not bread, but the body of Christ.*

To which it was truly answer'd, *That in this fourth Catech.* he bids them not to consider it *as meer bread*; As if a man should break in pieces the Kings Broad Seal, and another to aggravate his fault, should tell him, *That which you have broken, is not Wax, but the Kings Broad Seal*; would not any one understand this, not to be denying it to be truly Wax, but that it was something far beyond that, by the Impression of the Royal Seal? Or, as if a Judg setting forth the Crime of a Clipper, should tell him, *that what he clipt was not silver, but the Kings Coin*, who would need an Infallible Interpreter to tell him, that by silver he meant common silver?

If St. *Cyril* had deliver'd any such Doctrine in any other place, that the substance of the Elements doth cease upon Consecration; or that nothing but the Accidents remain, there might have been some colour for his urging this place *for the Roman Tenet*. But I desire St *Cyril* may interpret himself, and I think he knew his own meaning better than Mr. *P.*

In the very same *Catech.* he saith, *Regard not therefore these as meer Bread and Wine, for they are the Body and Blood of Christ according to our Lords Word.* Are not these as plainly St. *Cyril's* expressions as the other; and going before them, to prevent misinterpreting that which follows? And if they are not to be look'd on as *meer bread and wine*, I think they are to be look'd on as *Bread and Wine* still. As if Christ be not to be look'd on as ψιλὸς ἄνθρωπος, as *a meer man*, I think it follows, that he is to be look'd on as *a true man*, but as one much more than a man; so whatever St. *Cyril* superadds by vertue of a Divine Ἐπιφοίτησις, as he

Μὴ πρόσεχε οὖν ὡς ψιλοῖς τῷ ἄρτῳ καὶ τῷ οἴνῳ· σῶμα γὰρ καὶ αἷμα χριστοῦ, κατὰ τὸν δεσποτικὸν τυγχάνει ἀπόφασιν.

Catech. 5.

he calls it, upon Consecration, yet he cannot be understood so, as to destroy the substance of the Elements, which if I mistake not, is the *Roman Tenet*.

And in this parallel place, St. *Cyril* uses the like expressions as to *seeing* and *tasting*. *Although thy sense suggest that to thee, viz.* that they are meer Bread and Wine; *yet let faith establish thee, judg not this matter by thy Tast.*

Ἐι γὰρ καὶ ἡ αἰσθησίς σοι τοῦτο ὑποβάλλει, ἀλλὰ ἡ πίστις σὲ βεβαιούτω, μὴ ἀπὸ τῆς γεύσεως κρίνης τὸ πρᾶγμα, &c.

What was here to be judged by the Tast? whether it were real Bread and Wine? That he doth not in the least question, that I can find; but whether there be nothing else but Bread and Wine? And as to this, he saith, *Sense is not to be Judg, but Faith.* And so say we.

Bellarmin, I remember, distinguisheth between the *positive Argument* from sense, and *the Negative*; *the positive Argument*, he saith, *is good: This is handled and seen, therefore it is a body; but not the Negative, this is not handled or seen, therefore it is not a Body*: So say I here, according to St. *Cyril*, The *Affirmative* judgment of sense was true, and to be relied upon; that which we see and tast to be Bread and Wine is really Bread and Wine; but the *Negative* judgment is not; *i.e.* we are not to judg by our Sight and Tast, that they are nothing else but meer Bread and Wine; for besides what was discerned by the Senses, they were according to our Saviour's word, *the Body and Blood of Christ.*

De Eucharist. l. 1. c. 14.

To make this yet more plain to be St. *Cyril*'s meaning, we have another Parallel place in the foregoing Discourse, where he speaks concerning the Holy *Chrism*; *Look not on this, saith he, as meer Ointment. Why not?*

Catech. 3.

Ἀλλ' ὅρα μὴ ὑπονοήσῃς ἐκεῖνο τὸ μύρον ψιλὸν εἶναι. Ὥσπερ καὶ ὁ ἄρτος τῆς εὐχαριστίας μετὰ τὴν ἐπίκλησιν τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, οὐκ ἔτι ἄρτος λιτὸς, ἀλλὰ σῶμα χριστοῦ· οὕτω καὶ τὸ ἅγιον τοῦτο μύρον, οὐκ ἔτι ψιλὸν, οὐδ' ὡς ἂν εἴποι τὶς κοινὸν μετ' ἐπίκλησιν, ἀλλὰ χριστοῦ χάρισμα, καὶ πνεύματος ἁγίου παρουσίᾳ τῆς ἐκεῖνο θεότητος ἐνεργητικὸν γινόμενον.

For

For as the Bread of the Eucharist after Invocation of the Holy Ghost, is no longer common Bread, but the Body of Christ; so this Holy Ointment is no longer meer or common Ointment, after Consecration, but the Gift of Christ, and by the Presence of the Holy Ghost hath a Divine Efficacy.

Can any thing be plainer than that St. *Cyril* meant the Bread after Consecration was no longer *common Bread*; Would any man now be thought to hold the *Roman Tenet*, who should talk at this rate? And that which he saith oftenest and plainest, ought to be taken for his true meaning.

The same thing he saith, concerning the Water in Baptism in his other Catechetical Discourses: *Come not to Baptism as to common Water, but as to the Spiritual Grace which is given with it*; which he repeats soon after, and saith, *It is not to be regarded as meer Water, but as that by which the Holy Ghost doth operate.*

Μὴ ὡς ὕδατι λιτῷ προσέλθῃς τῷ λουτρῷ ἀλλὰ τῇ μετὰ τοῦ ὕδατος δοθείσῃ πνευματικῇ χάριτι.
Μὴ τῷ ψιλῷ τοῦ ὕδατος προσέχῃς, ἀλλὰ τῇ τοῦ πνεύματος ἁγίου ἐνεργείᾳ.

Here is such a similitude of Expressions as may make it most reasonable for us to assert that he understood them in the same manner.

But it may be objected, *That he no where saith, It is not Water in Baptism, as he doth here, it is not Bread, but the Body of Christ.*

I answer, That he saith, It is not meer Water, and that is as much as he means as to the Bread in the Eucharist. And that he doth not so make the Bread to be the Body of Christ, as to destroy the substance of the Bread; I shall further prove from St. *Cyril* himself.

(1.) Car-

(1.) Cardinal *Bellarmin* lays down this Rule, *That saying, This Bread is my Body, the Proposition must be either figurative; or absurd and impossible, for the Bread cannot be the Body of Christ.* The like is affirmed both by *Suarez* and *Vasquez*. If now St. *Cyril*, in plain terms affirms this, Then he cannot speak according to the *Roman Tenet*; but his Words are express, *That Christ spake of the Bread, when he said, This is my Body**. And this is in the very same Discourse with the other passage; and therefore if his words be taken in the strict and literal sense, St. *Cyril* must speak that which was *false and impossible*; for he affirms of the very Bread, that it was the Body of Christ.

Bell de Eucharist. l. 1. c. 1. Sect. 9. *Suarez* in 3. p. Th. Disp. 58. Sect. 7. *Vasquez* in 3. p Th. Disp. 180. c. 9

* Καὶ εἰπόντος περὶ τοῦ ἄρτου, τοῦτόμεν ἐστὶ τὸ Σῶμα. *Catech. Mystag.* 4.

Bellarmin saith, St. *Cyril doth not speak of material, but of consecrated Bread, which is material to appearance, but in substance is Cœlestial Bread.* If this be true, St. *Cyril* talked very impertinently; for he speaks of *the Bread which Christ took into his hand*, and Consecrated. I desire Mr. *P.* to tell us what sort of Bread that was; if it were *Cœlestial Bread*, as he calls it, then the *Transubstantiation* was made before Consecration; which I think is not agreeable to the *Roman* Tenet. But if it were the substance of Bread when Christ took it, then *Bellarmin*'s sense cannot hold. And withal, the Proposition would be Identical, *i. e.* Ridiculous; for then the sense would be, This Bread is my Body, *i. e.* My body is my body; for that Cœlestial bread is the very body of Christ

De Eucharist. l. 2. c. 13.

2. The *Roman Tenet* is, That *there is a total change of the whole Substance of the Bread into the Substance of the Body of Christ.* But I can find nothing in St. *Cyril*; which implies any such Change He doth indeed affirm, That the Bread after invocation of the Holy Spirit by its Presence and Efficacy is made the body of Christ. But he might suppose this

this to be done, as the body of Christ was produced in the Womb of the Virgin, by the Power of the Holy Ghost; and yet Christ had true Human Nature in him, being born of the Virgin, as well as conceived by the Holy Ghost. So here, the true Substance of the Bread might remain, yet by the Operative Power of the Holy Ghost, that Bread might become the Body of Christ; not by being changed into the substance of that Body which was born of the blessed Virgin, but by an immediate presence of the Spirit of Christ in it. And to this purpose St. *Cyril* speaks in those Catechetical Discourses: For, he saith, *The Church prays God to send his Holy Spirit to make the Bread the Body of Christ.* And so the Bread is changed not from being Bread, to be none, but from being common Bread, to be the Body of Christ; not by an Hypostatical Union, but by a Divine *Presence and Energy.* For this seems to me to have been his Opinion; viz. *That all true Believers were to be made partakers of the Divine Nature, by the body and blood of Christ in us; and so we become of the same body and blood with him*; but he never imagined this to be done by the Eucharistical Bread being changed into the substance of Christ's Body in Heaven; but that it being changed by the Holy Ghost, it was thereby made the Body of Christ; which being receiv'd; *he thought it did not pass into the draught, but was distributed through the whole man, for the benefit both of Soul and Body.* This, as far as I can judg, was his true opinion; I am not now to examin whether

Τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα ἐξαποστεῖλαι ἐπὶ τὰ προκείμενα, ἵνα ποιήσῃ, τὴν μὲν ἄρτον, σῶμα χριστοῦ. *Catech.* 5.

Ἅγια τὰ προκείμενα, ἐπιφοίτησιν δεξάμενα ἁγίου πνεύματος. *Ibid.*

Πάντως γὰρ οὗ ἐὰν ἐφαίσται τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, τοῦτο ἡγίασται καὶ μετεβλήθη. *Ibid.*

Οὕτω κατὰ τὴν μακάριον Πέτρον θεῖαι κοινωνοὶ φύσεως γινόμεθα. *Catech.* 4.

Catech. 5.

whether it were reaſonable or not; but I think it is evident to any common underſtanding, that this is far enough from the *Roman Tenet*, for which Mr. *P.* hath ſo ſolemnly vouched his Authority.

But the *Greek Fathers* were men of finer thoughts, than to entertain ſo groſs a notion as that of *Tranſubſtantiation*; which was firſt ſtarted by a Weſtern Monk of no great capacity, and was oppoſed by the men of Wit and Learning at that time. One who had been much in the Eaſt, and ſuckt in the opinions of the *Greeks*, was the moſt earneſt oppoſer of it. But Ignorance and Superſtition prevailing in the Weſtern Church, it came by degrees to be owned and received by it; eſpecially after the Biſhops of *Rome* concerned themſelves in the quarrel againſt *Berengarius*. From that time the *Authority* and *Infallibility* of the *Roman Church* and *Tranſubſtantiation*, have been ſo cloſely united, that they cannot part with this (though like an *Ephialtes*, it lyes ſo heavy upon it) without giving up the other. But as long as Learning and Liberty continued in the *Greek* Church, they were utter ſtrangers to it, (what Barbariſm and a very prevailing Argument among the Modern *Greeks*, may have done as to the receiving *Tranſubſtantiation*, I am not much concerned to enquire.) But as to the Learned *Greek* Fathers, as far as I can find, they knew nothing at all of it. They had a notion among them, of a real Body of Chriſt in the Sacrament after Conſecration; but they ſtill ſuppoſed the ſubſtance of the Elements to remain, as fully appears by that very Diſcourſe M. *P.* nibbles at; but it will break his Teeth to anſwer it.

I am unwilling to end my Anſwer to this charge of *moſt diſingennous dealing about St. Cyril's Teſtimony*, without putting him in mind of an extraordinary in-

stance of this kind in a Reverend Father of the Society, even before the pretended infallible Head of the Church.

In the time of *Clement* the Eighth, the Controversie *de Auxiliis* was carried so high between the *Jesuits* and *Dominicans*, that the Pope himself resolved to have the hearing of it. And the Generals of both Orders were to chuse their Divines, and to be present with them. *Greg. de Valentia* was of one side, and Father *Lemos* of the other. The Controversie came to a passage of St. *Augustine*, which *Greg. de Valentia* alledged; the other answer'd, it was not so in his Book, and desired to see that which *Greg. de Valentia* used; he was very unwilling, but the Pope commanded him; *F. Lemos* cried out, the Text was falsified, and desired a third Person might read it; and upon reading it, it was so found; upon which the Pope with a stern look, and a dreadful note, cried to him, *Ho!* which struck the poor Father into such a consternation, that he fell down in a swoon, and was taken up half dead, and carried out, and never more appear'd in any Congregation, but was sent away to *Naples*, where he died some Months after.

Tradition de l'Eglise Romaine sur la Predestination de Saints & sur la Grace, efficace, Tom. 2. Par. 3. p. 226. Avertisement, n. 5.

This story is very lately printed with evident proofs, by *Roman* Catholicks out of the *Original Acts* of that *Congregation*. And this I think was *most distinguishing dealing with St. Augustin*. If Mr. *P.* can find any such dealing among us, let him charge it home upon us. But I think I have said enough at present for my own Vindication.

As to his other Charges which concern your self, I doubt not but in short time to see a satisfactory Answer from a better hand. I am,

Octob. 12. 1687.

Sir, *Your Faithful Friend and Servant,*
E. S.

ACCUS. 5.

D. *T.* has *without a Text of Scripture for it*, Published four of Mr *Pulton's Letters*, and very injuriously conceal'd his fifth (*a*) which was the most material of all, containing *A. P's* clearing himself from the Doctor's false aspersions, whereby he charges *A P.* with not having stood to the Agreement.

(*a*) Mr. P's Rem. p. 39.

ANSWER.

He needed no Text, he gave Mr. *Pulton* fair warning of it, and was not forbidden by him; for in these words I wrote to him in my Answer to his Fourth Letter, (*b*) 'You have my Letters, and I yours, &c. do 'with them what you please, and write what you please 'further, and I will take the like freedom. And thus the *very great injury* is vanished. But if that *fifth Letter* was very *injuriously conceal'd*, why does he not thank me for the publishing of the rest? for all of them were as worthy of the light as this? I had answer'd before what was *material* in it, his *denial of an Agreement* *, and I did not think it worth the while to publish the same things so very often. Yet seeing he thinks this Letter *very injuriously* conceal'd, I will make amends for the injury, and publish it here, and it shall come forth in its original English of *write* for *written*, and *wrighting* for writing; and all that have an eye can see how *material* it is.

(*b*) D.T's Account, p. 51.

* See Mr. P's 4th. Let. p. 48. in my Account, and my Answer, p. 50. — I will not be tedious in answering yours of the 11th. Instant, in Relation to our agreement; for of that we have Witnesses, &c.

The Savoy *Octob.* 14. 1687.

Honoured Sir,

YOU were pleased to insist again in your last, upon my not standing to my agreement; I must mind you again, that your own conscience is witnes all our discourse of WRIGHTING, was in reference to the quotation of St. *Ambrose* and farther carrying on the matter in debate and that no body mentioned a tittle of giving or not giving an account of the pure matter of fact past. However, take it as you please, I never gave a Copy otherwise then to be WRITE out (and that with expres order of distributing no copies) nor shall you ever produce the man that had one from me, or by my order, knowlege, or consent, till I had sent you your's, and this I can prove, and if you charge me with the contrary, it shall be incumbent on you to make it out. I return you many thanks for your obliging profer of sending me the first sheet, I desire you will not give your self that trouble, it will suffice that you send me a Copy of the whole, the evening before you publish it (if such be your resolutions) and I will do the same. For your remarks upon the narrative which I here send you at large, I leave it to you to send them or not, and I will proceed therin as you shall prescribe, if you send me yours, Ile send you mine, but I must acknowlege having no Secretary or Servant it is very

very troublesome and expensive to me, but I am willing to shew herein, that I am desirous to prove my self,

Honoured Sir

Your Obediant Servant,

And. Pulton.

One Favour I must beg, (*viz.*) that you will be pleased, when you print to note your Paragrafs as I have don.

ACCUSAT. VI.

MR. *P.* concluded the first Collation which he gave the World (*a*) with very bitter Sawce; '*Blood* '*spilt* in abundance by the Reformed, upon false *Pre* 'tence of *Gospel*-Liberty: And again, in his *Remarks*, 'he is talking of *Severity*, and *Sanguinary Laws*; of 'my Rancour (*b*) and hypocritical Charity (*c*).

I am personally accused of bitterness, tho no man was yet the worse for me, for *meer Religion*, one hair of his head: I am also involv'd in the common Cause of the Reformed, as a *bloody* man; and you must not doubt of this, for Mr. *Pulton's* CATHERINA IN NUBIBUS, can plainly prove it by this Certificate; 'I do 'testifie, That D. *T.* is a Sanguinary Man, for he is by 'Church-Principle, against RESISTING the *Higher* '*Powers*, and approves not of the EXCLUDING and 'DEPOSING Doctrines taught in Mr. *P's* great *Late*-'*ran* Council, before there were *Jesuits*, and also after they

(*a*) M. P's true and full Account, p. 17, 18.
(*b*) Rem. Ep. Ded. p. 2, 10. &c.
(*c*) P. 32.

'they arose, by *Bellarmin*, and *Doleman*, and a long 'train of others, in which some *Popes*, some *Synodical* 'men, have pompously marched.

Let any man that pleases, set *her* hand to this Certificate, if she neither understands nor likes it her self; for they may do it as safely as it was done in that *Testimonial* which Mr. *Pulton* has published out of his GREAT SINCERITY.

And here again I must withdraw my self from under the obedience of Mr. *Pulton*, and tell him a story, a very true one: And it will appear by this story, that a Pope can be Sanguinary in reality, whilst I am only such by Misrepresentation. I will give it you in the words of an unquestionable Author, for he is one of their own (*f*). 'The King (that is, *Philip* the Second 'of *Spain*) having imprisoned his Eldest Son *Don Carlos*, because (as was known after his death) he designed both against the Service of the Kingdom, and 'against the Person of his Father; and the Pope having Intelligence from *France* that there were many 'Chests full of *Calvin*'s Catechisms in the *Spanish* 'Tongue in *Lyons* and *Toulouse*; he was not wanting to 'write upon this occasion a Brief to the King, both to 'encourage and to comfort him.

(*f*) Vita del Papa Pio Quinto scritta da Girolamo Catena dedicata al Sisto Quinto in Roma 1587. p. 93.

And because (*g*) it is a thing very remarkable that the King should make a Sacrifice of his own Flesh and of his own Blood to God, and *Pius* publickly commended his Christian and Catholick Mind and Religion, saying, BECAUSE HE SPARED NOT HIS OWN SON, I will here set down the Letter which he writ with his own hand to the Pope. —— [then follows the Letter, too large to be inserted.]

(*g*) Et perche è Cosa molto notabile, che'l Re facesse sacrificio della sua Carne, et del suo sangue a Dio, & Pio publicamente commendo la Christiana, & Catholica mente & Religione di lui, dicendo *Quia proprio filio non pepercit*, porro qui la Lettera ch'Egli scrisse di man propria al Papa.

For

For this matter at present, I will refer the *Jesuit* to an *Ingenious man* who is a *Third person* betwixt us. Both of us say the *Scriptures* are ours, and the *Fathers* are ours, *Reason* is ours, and *History* is ours; let us put the matter to Arbitration. *Mr. *P.* is for a REFERENCE. I am content. I will not indeed presume as he does, to use familiarly His Majesties SACRED NAME: But *in this case* I will agree to *the Award of a fellow-subject*, who bears his Testimony against Sanguinary proceedings in all Parties; and so far as they are unchristianly *Sanguinary* (even in my Arbitrators *some* (a) *Protestants*, if he throughly knows them, and proves it upon them) I am not of their Temper. If it be in both (b) *Hypocritical Charity*, 'tis more, on my part, than I have ever yet known by my self; and for *him*, I judge him by his Profession; and believe not (as *Romanists* do believe) that *an Angel from Heaven can search the Heart.* * And thus having put this matter to *Reference*, I shall acquiesce.

(*) Rem. p. 31. *A. P.* in this matter *refers* himself to his most Sacred Majesty.

(a) Seas. Ca. against Popery, p. 36.

(b) Mr. Pulton's Rem. p. 32.

* Hen. Holdeni, Epist. ad III. *D.D. N.N.* Anglum inqua de 22. propos.

ex Libr. Thomæ Angli ex Albiis excerptis, & a facultate Theologica Duacena damnatis sententiam suam dicit. Propos. 9, & 10.

Mr.

Mr. Pulton's *True and Full Account*, p. 17, 18.

THE Reformers —— had taken the Priviledge upon a false pretence of Gospel-liberty, to SPILL MORE CHRISTIAN BLOOD through all *Germany*, *Bohemia*, *France*, *Low-Countries*, *Holland*, *England*, and wherever they assum'd the Reforming Spirit, than ever the *Roman* Catholicks had done from Christ's time, nor should [D. *T.*] ever show they propagated their Faith by the Swords point. ——

William Penn's *SEASONABLE CAVEAT against POPERY*, &c. *printed in* Quarto *in the year* 1670. *Chap.* 10. of Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, *p.* 35, 36.

TO conclude —— If we would not receive a Thief until he had repented: Let the *Papist* first recant his *Voluminous Errors* (not known in Scripture, nor ever heard of for Three hundred years together after Christ): But above all, Let us have good Testimony of his hearty sorrow for that SEA OF BLOOD shed in *England*, *France Holland*, *Ireland*, *Spain*, *Italy*, *Savoy*, *Switzerland*, and *Germany*, of many Hundred Thousands of Poor *Protestants*, that for *pure Conscience*, could not conform to their most exorbitant practices, as well as new Doctrines imposed upon them: such inhumane and bar-

barbarous inventions and cruelties, as *no Age* could ever Parallel, and are the only demonstrations of their wicked Wits, that liv'd in *that*; and that not only upon the Parties themselves, but their poor little innocent Babes.

CHAP. VIII.

Mr. Pulton *considered in his Triumphs.*

HIS Triumphs are made up of Two things.

1. His performances in the Conference.
2. The wonderful Success that followed it.

1. He *perform'd mightily* in the *Conference*; and as if he had had a double Portion of the spirit of every one of his *Six Uncles who were Jesuits*(a). I will give you a true Representation of his way of *performing* in the *Conference*; and I submit it to you, whether he who has perform'd so *little* as he has done in *Two printed Books* upon *deliberation*, could perform so much as his *Party* has boasted of together with *himself, in his talk at adventure.*

(a) Mr. P's Rem. Ep. Ded.

His *way* of *performing*, consisted in repeating the Names of some of the Fathers, and some *Questions* over and over, without condescending either to *accept* the *Answer*, or to *enervate* it. What is the Rule of Faith? How do you prove the Bible? From what Copies had you it? What Copies? What Copies? When? How? Where? St. *Justin Martyr*, St. *Irenæus*, &c. St. *Justin Martyr*, St. *Irenæus*, &c. And when

I was desiring to speak to St. *Ambrose* which he first alledged, he was still at his *Cries*, St. *J. Martyr*, St. *Irenæus*, &c. He was at more than his *Once*, *Twice*, *Thrice*, at his *Auction of Strong Reasons*. In good earnest, this is no Mockery; it can be attested by the Oaths of many Judicious and Serious People present; this is as true as it would be pleasant, if the Conference had not been about *Religion*. And thus because he would *ask on*, and throw the same Stone again into the Well after it had been taken out and laid before him, he calls this VICTORY; but by his leave, a Grammarian who gives *words their freedom*, and sets them at liberty from their Signification, recedes from his Art. They were used to these *Victories* beyond the Alps, whilst the *Jesuits* preached the *Mountebanks* down from their own Stages. I believe such a man as the Excellent Bishop *Saunderson* would have been silenced by this way: And his Reputation would have suffer'd through his modesty; but I who had less *Learning and more confidence* than he, did set my Face against his *Face*, as well as my Reason, and what he calls my Rule, against his *shews* of *Reason* and *Authority*.

Now I must confess an Infirmity, and own to my Reader, that he still stands in my Fancy, in the Figure of a Man of *Huffing Valour*, who asks for his Adversary, tho' he is in readiness; and threatens to draw, and immediately to slay him; and still he does nothing, tho' there is no Lock upon his sheath. He goes away and triumphs, and at last shews his Sword to the World, and it appears to be a weapon *of Lath*.

(a) Mr. P's Rem. p. 33. Singular Effects of D. T's *Conference*.

But, *Secondly*, as he triumphs in his performance in the Conference, so he glories still more in the *success* that attended it (a). He will tell you it himself; for he has the Art of putting the Laurel on his own Head. He

glories

glories not indeed in Mrs. *R.* in Mr. *V.* or Mrs. *V.* who were all come over in the Taverns and Coffee-houses, but confirm'd at home. But let that pass; he has other *Triumphs* which will render him a Man of Fame to Posterity. *There are* (*a*) he says (and we have found him a man of his word) at *least two a gaining*; (two in *fieri*, in his beloved *Latin*); and *J. S.* is in *facto esse*; Why! here's the success of the D. of *Lorain* and *Morosini*. Nay further, the Report of that *Catholick Ladies Leaving the Roman Faith, is false*; we have it upon his Certificate in the Margin. [but what if more than Two are coming from his Church, and from under his very Wings, tho' they are not Ladies?] And that the *Tyber* loses more ground on the one side, than it gains on the other. If *he* had had a FAIR CONFERENCE, he questions not but he should have been yet more successful; if he might have read on in his *Speculum* and *Breviary*, and *been suffer'd* to set time back some hundreds of years, and brought *Paschasius* acquainted with *Innocent* the Third, no doubt he had been the *Xaverius* of the *Savoy*. But as it was, he carry'd off young *I.S.* and Ten days after *I.S.* was *reconciled*. I had thought they were very good friends before; but the *Mayor* is no *Mayor* till the *Show* be over.

(*a*) Rem. p. 33.

I pity any that are seduced, from the bottom of my Heart; but if any shall go away upon noisy Talk, and such Motives as Mr. *P.* has yet given either in his Discourse, or Catechizing, or Printed Books (in which the World may see his strength) they are either very weak in Capacity, or strong in their inclinations to wander.

Now, seeing he has writ what he would have said about *his main point*, and no body has given him interruption, and some-body (they say) has given him help; we shall surely, ere long, have his Two turn'd to Fifty; for his REMARKS must certainly carry all before him.

And now methinks I see him in the figure into which *Valerian* the famous *Capuchin* once condescended to put himself. 'Has it not been told you? have you not read '(says the humble *Valerian*) (*a*) how I overcame *Bar-* '*tholomew Nigrinus* in a Publick Disputation? I am the 'man who laid along that Pillar of *Calvinism* in *Poland*. But what said some of our Inns of Court, after hearing Mr. *Pulton* when they came out of the Door of the *Savoy* Mass-house? This man does *banter* finely. *Atheists* he may make by such discourse; but if he makes any *Papists*, he works a Miracle. And this (I assure him) is not Invention, but History.

(*a*) Val. Mag. Actio 5. pro fide Cath. p. 227. Sed num tibi relatum non est, num non legisti Bartholomeum Nigrinum, victum in disputatione publica? Ille ego sum qui prostravi illud Columen Calvinismi in Polonia.

CHAP. IX.

Mr. Pulton *considered in his Threatnings.*

HE has both *promised* and *threatn'd* what he would do. His promises he is not very likely to perform, for he has said he will give an Answer to certain places, when produc'd from *Beda* and *Heveden*, and such others. There can be no Answer, there may be evasion.

He has threatned, if I tell any more *Tales* of *Jacks* and *Past-board-Heads*, that he will come forth with what I know not (*a*). It may be, he intends a second Century of Scandalous Ministers, and an Appendix to the *Cobler of Gloucester*. But let him remember the man that blew the Coal, till the sparks put out his Eyes. He threatens me with himself, and Mr. *Meredith* his Second. Let Mr. *M.* come forth: Possibly some or other may oblige him in the Art of wrangling, for he loves to be engaged. He is the very Salesman at every Auction of Argu-

(*a*) Mr. P's Rem. p. 32, 33. 40, &c.

ments.

ments. He may ſtill find himſelf buſineſs if he pleaſes; but I have Employment more worthy my time.

He *Threatens* me with an Anſwer (*b*) about S. *Ambroſe*; if he can effect that, he will be greater than his very great *Cardinal Bona*: And let the Ball be between them for the ſhowing of their Unity. He will do more, he will *ſhow my Contradictions* (*c*). Alas, good Man! they are innocent things, a man cannot celebrate *Maſs* without them; but he will ſhew them like *Catharine Lamb*, whom no body could ſee.

(*b*) Mr. P's Rem. p. 38.

(*c* M. P's Rem. p. 38.

The CONCLUSION.

MANY things might be further added, as *Ex. Gr.*

1. He charges me with producing theſe words *, [Ever ſince the pretended Reformed had proceeded upon the word of the Devil.] Inſtead of theſe, [Now I ask, whether the Doctrine delivered by the ſpirit of Untruth can be from the Holy Ghoſt?] And he cites the firſt and ſecond Pages, whilſt in thoſe Pages, all is repeated from what *J. S.* ſaid before Witneſs, before the Conference. And that which is reported as Mr. *P's* in the Conference, is in the 7*th.* Page in theſe words, which he has confirmed inſtead of diſowning them. [Mr. *P.* proceeded to talk about *Luther* and the Devil, and his leaving Maſs at the Devil's inſtance.]

* Mr. P's Rem. p. 1.

2. He ſays he began not to Catechiſe till ‖ after *Whitſuntide*, and from thence he infers that he could not tamper with *J. S.* who had waver'd before. As if there were no Tamperers beſides himſelf; and as if he could not tamper with him in private, before he did it in publick.

‖ Mr. P's Rem. p. 2.

He

‡ M.P's Rem. p. 2. 3. He condemns me for giving *J. S.* so ‡ publick a Reproof, tho 'twas done after private admonition, and after he had brought *J. S.* upon the Stage; for I was of *Solomon*'s mind, who esteemed of *open rebuke as better than secret love.* And hearing what his Relations, his Master and Mistris, and Fellow-servants had said, I could not *then* stroke him as Mr. *P.* did, by calling him [a very Candid, ingenuous, laborious, tractable youth.] (*b*) God (I hope) will make him so, while he is with true Friends.

(*b*) Mr. P's Rem. p. 2.

4. He tells his Reader, that when I quoted *Paschasius Radbertus*, (*d*) *saying there were three Sacraments; I naming which they are, should have added, he allowed no more than three, which I can never make out.* As if, when St. *John* said, *There are three that bear record in Heaven*, he should have told us, *there are but three.*

(*d*) Mr. P. Rem. p. 7.

5. He charges me with *three Calumnies* (*e*), upon my telling the story of *Abbot Theodore*; tho it be told by me out of the *Acts* of his Council of *Nice*, as published by his Brethren *Labbe* and *Cossart*, whose very Pages are cited.

(*e*) Rem. p. 14.

6. He has found in one of his Store-houses (*i. e.* the *Guide* ‡ *in Controversie*) that the Rock πέτρα in *Greek*, is in the *Syriack Kypha*, which is of the Masculine Gender; as if the Primitive Translator (if Saint *Matthew*'s Gospel was Translated out of *Hebrew*) could have better render'd his sense by a word of the Masculine than of the Feminine Gender. If that had been his opinion, he would have done it.

‡ Guid. in Contr. Disc. 1. p. 5.

7. He formerly reflected on the *Greeks* as *Lyars* and *Hereticks* *. Now he professes †, that he said it not in *his own, but in my opinion.* This is for the sweetning of the *Greeks* in the *Morea.* He is very politick in nicking of Junctures.

* D. T's Account, p. 11.

† Mr. P. *Rem.* p. 25.

8. He

8. He says, *I mistake* ‖, when I assert, *That the Roman Church proves her being and Authority out of the Scriptures.* To say that they *can* or *do prove it out of the Scriptures*, is a mistake I am not apt to be guilty of; but to say that they *attempt* to do it, is none; for to this purpose they alledg so very often, *Hear the Church*; and, *Thou art Peter*, &c. ‖ *Rem.* p. 25.

9. He calls for our Catalogue of *Witnesses against their Errors.* Yet he had heard of the Works of *Illyricus* and others of this nature. And I am not ashamed to own that I published in the *English Tongue*, divers Months ago, the *Testimonies* of Writers in the several Ages of Christianity against Transubstantiation (*a*).

10. He pull'd a Book of written Collections together with his *Breviary* out of *his Pocket*, as sure as he put my Paper into it; and there were eyes enough to discern it; and now he denies he *ever produced it* (*b*) perhaps he never read out of it; or according to his Evasion about shewing *Luther's* works, he never *produc'd it in the Pulpit.*

11. He mentions a place in St. *Ambrose*, which in his Opinion is *evidently against me*, and which (he says) I refused to hear (*c*). It was not worth either my Attention or my Answer; for I had before told him the true Meaning of all such Places; *viz.* That Consecration altered Sacramental Elements from common to Sacred things in use and benefit; and that the Fathers used the same Expressions about the *Water* in Baptism, as about Bread and Wine in the Lords Supper, whilst no body imagines the Substance of the Water is by the most powerful benediction remov'd. In that very Chapter, a fragment of which is cited by Mr. *P.*, *St. *Ambrose* compares the Change in the *Lords Supper* upon Consecration, with that in *Baptism*, and proves the

(*a*) A Treatise by an Author of the *Roman* Communion, touching Transubstant. 4to, *London*, 1687. out of *French.*

(*b*) *M. P's Rem.* p. 28.

(*c*) Ibid p. 38.

* S. A. de iis qui Myst. initiantur. c. 9. p. 427, 428. Compare this ch. with ch. 3. p. 422. Quid vidisti? Aquas utique sed non solas, &c.

the Change of Baptismal Regeneration, by that with which he had just before illustrated the Change in the Eucharist; the Miraculous Conception of Christ in the Blessed Virgins Body: *Disputants*, who like unsatisfied *Beggars* will still ask on, extort a *Reproof* instead of a Grant.

* Mr. P's *Rem.* p.40.

12. He Charges me * with a Reflection upon the Apostles who preached in rich and warm Countries; because I took notice (tho from *Balzac* a Papist) that *Missionaries* chose such places rather than *Nova Zembla*. But he takes no notice of the Argument it self, That the talk of Conversions, and of Places, and Numbers, and Qualities, is insignificant, unless it be first prov'd that men are not made Proselytes as the *Scribes* and *Pharisees* made them, but converted to *True Religion*.

But enough, if not too much, has been said in Answer to Objections, which are not real Difficulties.

Perhaps my Readers have already taken Compassion on themselves, and left off some Pages before they have come at this. And I think it is time to relieve my self, after having been concern'd in a Controversial matter which in the *nature* of it I do not much *relish*; and which by the *length* of it, has created in me a most ungrateful *Satiety*.

FINIS.

ERRATA.

PAge 20.l.15.for *Homousion*, read *Homousion*. Marg. for ὁμοιούσιος, r. ὁμοούσιος; p.21. Marg. l.9. f. *At*, r. *Aut*; p.26.l.30. f. *it must be*, r. *they would have it be*; p.29.l.39. f. *design*, r. *designs*; p.33. and often elsewhere, *Objection*, f. *Objections*; p.52.l.27. f. *Churches*, r. *Church*. There are other mistakes which are left to the Correction of the Judicious Reader.

ADVERTISEMENT.

WHereas there has been a Paper cry'd by some Hawkers, as a Sermon preached by D. T. *at the Funeral of* M. E. Gwynn, *this may Certify, that that Paper is the Forgery of some Mercinary people.*

BOOKS